THE

ANTIJACOBIN

Review and Magazine,

&c. &c. &c.

For JANUARY, 1808.

Inſtructed ſhips ſhall ſail to quick commerce,
By which remoteſt regions are ally'd;
Which makes one city of the univerſe,
Where ſome may gain, and all may be ſupply'd.

DRYDEN.

ORIGINAL CRITICISM.

Britain Independent of Commerce; or Proofs adduced from an Inveſtigation into the true Cauſe of the Wealth of Nations, that our Riches, Proſperity, and Power, are derived from Reſources inherent in Ourſelves, and would not be affected though our Commerce were annihilated. By William Spence, F. L. S. 8vo. Pp. 85. Cadell and Davies. 1807.

IN ſome caſes it may be wiſe policy to affect to undervalue the good things which we enjoy, and in other caſes to deſpiſe thoſe which are out of our reach. Oppoſite as theſe maxims naturally are to each other, Mr. Spence has united them both in his ſervice; for in pointing out "the ceſſation of the jealouſy and envy with which we are regarded by the reſt of the powers of Europe, and by America, and the conſequent diminution of the cauſe of future wars," among the advantages which may reſult from the acquiſition of right ideas relative to the value of commerce, he avails himſelf of the former maxim; and in expatiating upon the indifference with which we ſhould learn to contemplate that diminution of our commerce which from various cauſes will, in his opinion, almoſt certainly take place, he adopts the latter. For our own part, we do not imagine, on the one hand, that Buonaparte

will ceaſe to covet ſhips, colonies, and commerce, notwithſtanding all the arguments Mr. Spence may uſe to perſuade him they are objects utterly unworthy of his attention: nor, on the other hand, do we entertain thoſe gloomy preſages of our political ſituation, either from the operation of our public debt, or the progreſſive improvements of rival nations*, which Mr. Spence adduces to juſtify the expediency of teaching his countrymen to contemplate the loſs of their commerce with reſignation, and even with indifference. In diſcuſſing the principles which he labours to diſſeminate, we ſhall therefore diſcard all conſiderations of policy, and bring them to the teſt of truth, that teſt by which all doctrines muſt ſtand or fall.

Mr. Spence, in his leading tenets, is an avowed diſciple of the French ſchool of political economiſts, or what is termed the agricultural ſect, who maintain that agriculture is the ſole ſource of national wealth, in oppoſition to the mercantile ſect, who contend that it may alſo be increaſed by manufactures and commerce. To eſtabliſh the former, and to controvert the latter of theſe poſitions, is the great object of this work; and the author thus exults in the gratification and delight which his countrymen will feel in being convinced that their greatneſs is independent of commerce.

"Even our merchants and our manufacturers, much as they are individually intereſted in the continuance of commerce, as patriots, muſt liſten with ſatisfaction to any arguments which ſhould ſet their minds at reſt, as to the ſtability of our wealth and our power. And ſurely the proprietor of land, of funded property, indeed all who have nothing to do with trade, would be delighted if they could be convinced, that their country, and the ſtake they have in it, are independent of the threats of an emperor, or the caprice of a republic; and that though Europe and America, Aſia and Africa, were to reſolve never more to uſe an article of Britiſh manufacture, ſtill this favoured iſle has the means within herſelf, not merely of retaining the high rank which ſhe poſſeſſes, but of progreſſively going on in her career of proſperity and of power."

After this introduction Mr. Spence commences the inveſtigation of his ſubject, by defining the meaning of the terms wealth and proſperity. His definition of the former is vague, but his diſtinctions between the former and the latter are clear and juſt. He then proceeds to enquire into the ſources of wealth and proſperity, and details the opinions of the mer-

* We conſider the ſecurity of property in Great Britain as more than a counterpoiſe to theſe diſadvantages.

cantile and agricultural ſects of political economiſts on this important topic. The former he diſpatches in a few words, by obſerving that they refer for proofs of the truth of their opinions to Tyre, Carthage, Venice, and Holland, ſtates which by their commerce, with very little territorial poſſeſſions, obtained acknowledged wealth; and ſtates it to be the policy of this ſect, to give the moſt active encouragement to commerce and manufactures by every means poſſible, even by oppreſſing the agricultural branches of induſtry in their favour.

The opinions of the followers of the agricultural ſect are given at conſiderable length. They maintain that no wealth can be derived from the fabrication of manufactures, which they conſider as a transfer not as a creation of wealth; and argue in ſupport of this poſition in the following manner. A manufacturer while employed in making a piece of lace worth 10*l*, muſt have conſumed a quantity of food worth 10*l*, and the ſame value being expended in the one article as was gained in the other, no profit can be the reſult of his induſtry. Or even ſuppoſing a profit to be derived to himſelf, and that he ſold this lace for 15*l*, the conſumer of the lace would loſe preciſely what the manufacturer gained, and the nation would not be either the more or the leſs wealthy in conſequence of this 15*l* being in the pocket of the one rather than in that of the other.

In one point of view, however, it appears to us, that even the followers of this ſyſtem muſt allow an increaſe of national wealth to be derived from manufactures. The improvements in machinery, and the advantageous diviſion and diſtribution of labour, which follow the eſtabliſhment of manufactures, neceſſarily lower the price of goods; and thus by enabling the landholder to command in exchange for his ſurplus produce, a larger proportion of ſuch articles as contribute to his wants or conveniences, make his revenue more productive; and adding to his revenue, is upon their own principles, adding to the national wealth.

The followers of this ſect alſo contend, that nowealth can be derived from commerce of import, as every nation pays an equivalent for what it purchaſes; and they apply the ſame reaſoning to the profit on this commerce, as was applied to the profit on the lace made by the manufacturer. They argue too, that although national wealth may be and is derived from commerce of export, yet but a very ſmall proportion of the wealth of any nation poſſeſſed of extenſive territory, can be derived from this ſource, ſince "the utmoſt profit that can

be gained on the exports of the moſt trading nation is trifling when compared to its actual wealth."

Though Mr. Spence conſiders the principle of the economiſts, that all wealth is deduced from agriculture, as perfectly correct, he aſſerts their application of it to be erroneous; and that an attention to facts will prove directly, in oppoſition to their opinion, "that in Britain, agriculture has thriven only in conſequence of the influence of manufactures, and that the increaſe of this influence is requiſite to its further extenſion." Inſtead of announcing this aſſertion in Italics, as an extraordinary diſcovery derived from an attention to facts, it would perhaps have been but candid to have acknowledged, that it may be found in a work which can hardly have eſcaped Mr. Spence's reſearches. "This natural order of things, has in all the modern ſtates of Europe been in many reſpects entirely inverted; and manufactures and foreign commerce together, have given birth to the principal improvements of agriculture." Smith's Wealth of Nations, book 3d, chap. 1ſt. In ſupport of the principle itſelf, that all wealth is deduced from agriculture, he puts two caſes, one in a ſociety with, and one in a ſociety without a circulating medium, which are founded on the ſame baſis with that of the lace manufacturer already quoted; and from which he draws the following concluſion, that "if the whole be fairly analyzed, and every thing traced to its ſource, it will in every caſe be found in the moſt refined, as in the moſt barbarous ſtate of ſociety, that agriculture is the great ſource, manufactures no ſource at all, of national wealth."

When it is conſidered that Mr. Spence meaſures the wealth of a country by the produce of its ſoil, and admits that this produce is increaſed by the increaſed demand occaſioned by manufactures, his argument that manufactures increaſe the produce of the ſoil, but do not add to the wealth of a country, appears to us to contradict his former admiſſion, and to be paradoxical in the higheſt degree.

After indulging for a while in the golden dreams of Condorcet and Godwin*, and pointing out an Agrarian law as the ſyſtem on which the greateſt proſperity might be enjoyed by

---

* We refer our readers, for a maſterly elucidation of the deluſive and viſionary theories of theſe advocates for a ſyſtem of equality, to the 1ſt and 2d chapter of the 3d book of Mr. Malthus' Eſſay on the Principle of Population, from which this part of Mr. Spence's work appears to have been borrowed; and to the 8th and 9th chapters of the 3d book of the ſame eſſay for a conciſe diſſertation on the agricultural and commercial ſyſtems.

the bulk of the ſociety, Mr. Spence acknowledges that this ſtate of happineſs could only be obtained by a revolution, and gives the following reaſon why it would not be of long duration.

"In a nation where ſuch plenty reigned, the great command of the Creator, to increaſe and multiply, would act in full force, and the population would double in twenty-five years, Suppoſing, then, this ſtate of things to continue, in ſeventy-five years from its eſtabliſhment, Britain would contain ninety-ſix millions of ſouls, a number full as great as could poſſibly exiſt on ſeventy-three millions of acres of land. Here, then, miſery would commence; the difficulty of procuring ſubſiſtence would be greater to the whole of ſociety, than it now is to a ſmall proportion; population would be at a ſtand, and on any occaſional failure of food, all the dreadful conſequences would enſue, which ſo frequently befal the over-peopled country of China."

From this digreſſion, he returns to his main ſubject, reaſſerts the grand axiom, "that all wealth is brought into exiſtence by agriculture," ſtates that agriculture and manufactures are the two chief wheels in the machine which creates national wealth," but that to ſet theſe wheels in motion there is a neceſſity for a moving power, which is the claſs of land proprietors, the great recipients of the revenue of the country, and upon the yearly expenditure of whoſe revenue the national wealth depends. This is well deſcribed.

"It is a condition, then, eſſential to the creation of national wealth, that the claſs of land proprietors expend the greater part of the revenue which they derive from the ſoil. They are the agents, through whoſe hands the revenue of the ſociety paſſes; but in order that wealth and proſperity ſhould accrue to the community, it is abſolutely neceſſary, that they ſhould ſpend this revenue. So long as they perform this duty, every thing goes on in its proper train. With the funds which the manufacturing and the unproductive claſſes appropriate to themſelves, from the expenditure of the claſs of land owners, from ſupplying the members of this claſs with the various objects of neceſſity, or of luxury, which their deſires, whether natural or factitious, require, they are enabled to purchaſe the food which the farmer offers to them. The farmer being enabled to diſpoſe of his produce, acquires the funds neceſſary for the payment of his rent, and thus, the revenue again reverts to the land proprietor, from whom it was in the firſt inſtance derived, again to be expended, and again to perform the ſame duty of circulation."

In this point of view, Mr. Spence conſiders luxury as abſolutely neceſſary to the well being of a ſociety conſtituted like that of Great Britain; nor does he apprehend that dan-

ger from it to this country, which ſome politicians who reaſon upon the decline and fall of the Roman empire have prognoſticated. The Romans, who devoted themſelves to arms, and committed all laborious occupations to their ſlaves, were ſoon enervated by that wealth and luxury which followed extended conqueſt; but as the ſource of our wealth is labour, the bulk of our population is neceſſarily laborious, and not liable therefore to ſink into indolence and effeminacy.

A ſeparate diſcuſſion then follows reſpecting commerce. Mr. Spence admits the conveniency ariſing from an interchange of commodities between different nations, and ſays,

"The reader will greatly err, if he ſuppoſe I am deſirous of proving, that it would be better for the world if there were leſs of it than there is. On the contrary there cannot be a warmer advocate than I am for its reaſonable extenſion. But, it has been almoſt univerſally believed, that, beſides being an accommodation and convenience, commerce is the greateſt poſſible ſource of national wealth. In this country, particularly, where commerce has been carried to a greater extent than in any other country of the ſame ſize, it is the opinion of almoſt all its inhabitants, that its wealth, its greatneſs, and its proſperity, have been chiefly derived from its commerce, and that theſe advantages can be continued and increaſed only by its continuance and extenſion.

"That theſe opinions, as far as they reſpect this country, are founded in truth, I cannot bring myſelf to believe, and I proceed to ſtate the grounds of my conviction of their fallacy.

"As all commerce naturally divides itſelf into commerce of import and export, I ſhall, in the firſt place, endeavour to prove, that no riches, no increaſe of national wealth, can in any caſe be derived from national commerce of import; and, in the next place, that, although national wealth may, in ſome caſes, be derived from commerce of export, yet, that Britain, in conſequence of particular circumſtances, has not derived, nor does derive, from this branch of commerce, any portion of her national wealth; and, conſequently, that her riches, her proſperity, and her power, are intrinſic, derived from her own reſources, independent of commerce, and might, and will exiſt, even though her trade ſhould be annihilated. Theſe poſitions, untenable as at firſt glance they may ſeem, I do not fear being able to eſtabliſh to the ſatisfaction of thoſe, who will diſmiſs from their mind the deep-rooted prejudices with which, on this ſubject, they are warped; and who, no longer contented with examining the mere ſurface of things, ſhall determine to penetrate through every ſtratagem of the mine which conceals the grand truths of political economy."

However important it may be in ſome caſes to diſtinguiſh between commerce of import and commerce of export, yet in diſcuſſing the queſtion, whether commerce in general be productive of advantage to the ſtate, this diſtinction is unneceſſary, and calculated to miſlead. Both are parts of the

ſame tranſaction: for every man who exports goods, intends to receive ſomething in return for them, or, in other words, to import; and the reſult of the whole muſt be taken together, to aſcertain the advantage or diſadvantage of the adventure. In ſome branches of commerce the principal profit is expected on the ſale of the goods exported, in others on that of the goods imported in return. For inſtance, goods ſhipped to the South Seas ſell at a great advance, and the returns are made in ſpecie or bullion, on which there is no profit. Goods ſhipped to the Weſt Indies alſo ſell at high prices, from which a loſs on the returns is generally to be deducted, whether made in produce or in bills of exchange. Bills now bear a premium there of more than 20 per cent, which merchants rather pay than take the riſque of making their returns in produce. The goods ſent to China by the Eaſt India Company, it is underſtood, ſell at or under prime coſt; but the profit on the teas which they take in return, compenſates them for this diſadvantage. The exports and the imports are parts of the ſame tranſaction: whether the ſhipper gains on the one or on the other is immaterial to him, provided he gains on the whole; to aſcertain which, they ſhould be conſidered jointly and not ſeparately. We however muſt follow that courſe which our author has thought proper to take.

The commerce of import is firſt conſidered, and illuſtrated by an example drawn from the purchaſe and importation of tea. Mr. Spence admits that by this tranſaction the government has increaſed the revenue, by the duties of cuſtoms and exciſe; that the ſhip owner, the underwriter, the proprietor of Eaſt India Stock, have all added to their individual wealth; but then he contends, that all theſe profits have been drawn from the conſumers of this tea; that whatever the former have gained the latter have loſt; and that a transfer, not a creation of wealth has taken place. To this doctrine we cannot ſubſcribe. In the firſt place, the caſe is miſſtated, for tea is procured in exchange for manufactures as well as ſpecie; and we contend that the advantageous employment of thoſe manufacturers who fabricated the goods with which this tea was purchaſed in China, and of the capital of thoſe merchants who carry on this trade, increaſes the number of our manufacturers and merchants, and by increaſing the demand for the produce of the land neceſſary for their ſubſiſtence, improves its cultivation and value, and conſequently increaſes the rent of the land holder, in proportion to whoſe revenue the wealth of the country muſt alſo increaſe. But if the tea were purchaſed with ſpecie alone, the argument would

remain preciſely the ſame; for the fabrication of our manufactures, and the ſale of them in any other part of the world, in order to procure this ſpecie neceſſary for carrying on our trade with China, muſt produce the ſame beneficial effects on the community, as if they had been exported to China in the firſt inſtance.

Mr. Spence admits that in ſome caſes an increaſe of national wealth may be drawn from commerce of export; and that, according to the reaſoning of the economiſts, the annual profit of Great Britain ariſing from this ſource may be eſtimated at ten millions: but he adds, "Compare this ſum with the public and private revenue of the country, and it will be ſeen to be perfectly inſignificant: more than twice this ſum is paid for the intereſt of the national debt, more than four times this ſum is paid to the Government in taxes;" and he eſtimates the yearly revenue derived from the ſoil of Great Britain at one hundred and twenty millions. The great practical importance of Mr. Spence's work appears to us to depend upon the correctneſs of theſe ſtatements, and the obſervations ariſing out of them. Some of his data have been adopted without due examination; and he has overlooked a very important diſtinction between diſpoſable and indiſpoſable national wealth. To ſave cavil, we will take the commercial profits at his own eſtimate; but in order to reduce their comparative importance, he calculates the value of the food produced from the ſoil of Great Britain at one hundred and twenty millions; and as according to his theory food is the only product of the ſoil which contributes to wealth, he eſtimates the annual wealth produced by agriculture at this amount. The individual conſumption of working people may average ſomething more than eight buſhels of wheat per annum; but as Mr. Spence's computation of twelve millions of perſons at 10*l* per annum each, includes both old and young, women and children, it is probable that this allowance, which is equal to about a quartern loaf and a half of bread per week, is more than the real conſumption. Eſtimating the wheat at 70*s* per quarter, this amounts to forty-two millions, to which add for meat and potatoes one-third, or fourteen millions, the whole is fifty-ſix millions, or leſs than one-half of Mr. Spence's eſtimate. The direct wealth, then, produced by commerce is to that produced by agriculture, as one to ſix; but it is further to be conſidered, that as whatever wealth commerce produces muſt be paid by other countries to Great Britain, it may be applied to the maintenance of fleets and armies abroad, to the aſſiſtance of foreign powers, to the purchaſe of ſuch arti-

cles as are eſſential either to the defence or the ſubſiſtence of the nation; and that if not wanted immediately, it may accumulate either at home or abroad, as a reſource againſt future exigencies: agricultural wealth on the contrary, according to the ſyſtem of Mr. Spence, is the daily food of the inhabitants of the kingdom, indiſpenſably neceſſary for their own conſumption; and therefore poſſeſſing none of theſe advantages, and convertible to none of theſe uſes. Much may be ſaid reſpecting the importance of foreign objects, but ſtill the name of wealth cannot juſtly be refuſed to that which places them within our power. Mr. Spence has overlooked the ſame diſtinction, in comparing the amount of our commercial profits with the amount of our annual taxation. What government receives for taxes with one hand, it repays for ſervices with the other. Individuals feel the preſſure, but the nation is neither richer nor poorer, in conſequence of this increaſed circulation. If a government without foreign commerce was under the neceſſity of ſending large ſums abroad from the produce of internal taxes, the national capital would gradually waſte away; as a reſervoir which conſtantly leaks, and is never repleniſhed, muſt at laſt become empty. We have thus ſhewn the importance of the commercial profits, which Mr. Spence eſtimates ſo lightly; and when it is conſidered, that with this diſpoſable ſurplus, aided to no very great extent by the export of ſpecie, all our foreign ſubſidies have been paid, all our fleets and armies on foreign ſtations have been maintained, and, above all, the foreign corn neceſſary for our ſubſiſtence has been purchaſed, the great importance of this ſource of wealth muſt be acknowledged.

Although the economiſts allow that an increaſe of national wealth is derived from commerce of export, Mr. Spence makes no ſuch conceſſion. He admits, indeed, that the profits of the maſter manufacturer and merchant are undoubtedly national profit, but nevertheleſs aſſerts that "Great Britain does not derive any acceſſion whatever of "wealth from commerce of export, and conſequently that "her riches, her greatneſs, and her power, are wholly derived "from ſources within herſelf, and are entirely and altogether "independent of her trade." In ſupport of theſe poſitions, he aſſumes it as a fact, that Great Britain imports as much as ſhe exports; and in proof of this hypotheſis, refers to the official account of her imports and exports laid before Parliament by the Inſpector General, which ſtates, on the contrary, that in 100 years, from the year 1700 to the year 1800,

the total value of our exports exceeded that of our imports by 348 millions. He then attempts to diſprove this document, by arguing, that if it were exact, either the quantity of precious metals in this country muſt have increaſed in that amount, or that the difference muſt have been applied to the payment of foreign nations for the expenditure occaſioned by our wars. That the quantity of plate, if not of coin, in this country, has very much increaſed within the laſt century, there can be no doubt; though Mr. Foſter conceives, in his Eſſay on the Principle of Commercial Exchange, that the whole of this difference between our imports and exports has been paid to foreign nations for the expence conſequent upon continental warfare. In reply to this poſition, Mr. Spence ſays,

"If this opinion were well founded, there would be no need to enter into any long argument to prove, that we have gained no acceſſion of wealth from our commerce of export. For if we have, in the courſe of a century, exported to the amount of 400 millions ſterling, in manufactured articles, for which we have never received any return whatever, the warmeſt advocate for commerce will ſcarcely aſſert that we can have got rich by ſuch a trade."

The queſtion at iſſue, is not whether this money has been wiſely applied, but whether it has been actually acquired; and Mr. Foſter, if correct in his ſtatement, proves that we have gained theſe 348 millions beyond the poſſibility of controverſy, by proving that we have ſpent them again.

Continuing this diſcuſſion, Mr. Spence reaſons thus:

"If it be clear, that no increaſe of national wealth can be derived from commerce of import, it is on the other hand equally plain, that in ſome caſes an increaſe of national wealth may be drawn from commerce of export. The value obtained in foreign markets, for the manufactures which a nation exports, reſolves itſelf into the value of the food which has been expended in manufacturing them, and the profit of the maſter manufacturer and the exporting merchant. Theſe profits are undoubtedly national profit. Thus, when a lace manufacturer has been ſo long employed in the manufacturing a pound of flax into lace, that his ſubſiſtence, during that period, has coſt 30*l*, this ſum is the real worth of the lace; and if it be ſold at home, whether for 30*l* or 60*l*, the nation is, as has been ſhown, no richer for this manufacture. But if this lace be exported to another country, and there ſold for 60*l*, it is undeniable that the exporting nation has added 30*l* to its wealth by its ſale, ſince the coſt to it was only 30*l*.

"Reaſoning in this way, an Economiſt would admit, that Britain

gainsſome increaſe of national wealth by her commerce of export. Yet he would be truly aſtoniſhed to obſerve the value which we ſet upon this commerce, when he calculated the probable amount of our national gains from this ſource, and compared it with the public revenue, and private expenditure of the country. He would reaſon thus: Great Britain, in the moſt proſperous years of her commerce, has exported to the amount of about fifty millions ſterling. If we eſtimate the profit of the maſter manufacturer, and the exporting merchant, at 20 *per cent* on this, it will probably be not far from the truth; certainly it will be fully as much, as in theſe times of competition is likely to be gained. Great Britain, then, gains annually by her commerce of export, ten millions. This ſum, in itſelf, ſeems conſiderable, but compare it with the public and private revenue of the country, and it will be ſeen to be perfectly inſignificant, and the trade from whence it ſprings in no degree entitled to rank as the chief ſource of its wealth. More than *twice* this ſum is paid for the intereſt of the national debt! More than *four times* this ſum is paid to the government in taxes! It cannot be ſuppoſed, that the receivers of this ten millions of profit from trade pay more than one fifth of the whole, which is two millions, in taxes. To this we may add, the cuſtom-houſe duties on exports, which may amount to nearly two millons more. Four millions, then, is the utmoſt that we can ſuppoſe the revenue derives, from Britiſh commerce of export. Whence, then, ſprings the remaining 36 or 40 millions, which are annually paid in taxes? Certainly from ſome ſource more productive than commerce of export. And as no wealth is created by manufactures ſold at home, or by commerce of import, from what ſource can this enormous amount of taxes be derived, but from the grand ſource of wealth, the ſoil."

This eſtimate of the extent of the advantages derived from commerce, both to the revenue and the nation, is very fallacious; as we ſhall prove by our obſervations on one ſingle article. The quantity of cotton annually imported into this kingdom is 270,000 bales, of about 250 lbs. weight each, or 67,500,000 lbs. weight. This commodity, in its raw ſtate, coſts on an average 1*s* 6*d* per lb. or 5,062,500*l*, and in its manufactured ſtate is worth, at a very low eſtimate, 6*s* per lb. or 20,250,000*l*; thus leaving an annual addition, to what Dr. Adam Smith terms the wages of labour, and the profits of ſtock, of more than 15 millons, which ſum, in furniſhing employment and ſubſiſtence to manufacturers and merchants, ſtimulates population, and, on Mr. Spence's own principle, brings proſperity to every branch of the community: for he ſays (page 19), "The increaſing population "of the manufacturing claſs would require more land to "be cultivated, and thus employment would be provided "for the additional population of the agricultural claſs,

"which would conſequently be enabled to give a greater "rent to the land proprietors," whoſe income he admits to be the ſource of national wealth. If ſimilar calculations were made on other articles of commerce and manufacture, they would ſhew that the immenſe profit thus acquired, independent of the duty upon imports and exports, neceſſarily pays a large proportion of the property tax*, the aſſeſſed taxes, the duty on ſtamps and exciſe, and in ſhort of every other great branch of the public revenue; and prove Mr. Spence's calculation on this ſubject to be as looſe, as his theory is erroneous. In his obſervations upon the feudal ſyſtem, he has admitted that wealth created by manufactures and commerce increaſed the national wealth, by giving additional value to the ſoil; yet with this fact in his recollection, and with the ſtill more recent example of a neighbouring kingdom before his eyes, where in conſequence of the ſudden annihilation of commerce and manufactures, the value of land fell from 20 years to 4 or 5 years purchaſe (the deficiency of the taxes formerly ſupplied from other ſources being then neceſſarily levied upon the land†), we find him blind to the conſequences of the loſs of commerce in this country, where its proportionate importance is much greater than ever it was in France. The plain truth is, that the flouriſhing ſtate of our commerce and manufactures, by increaſing our population and the demand for food in the ſame proportion, has given that value to the land, which has enriched its pro-

---

*Diſtinct accounts are kept of the returns made under the different ſchedules of the Property Tax Act. The lateſt which we have had an opportunity of ſeeing are thoſe for the year ending the 30th April, 1805; and it will probably ſurpriſe Mr. Spence to hear, that they give the following reſult:

Rent of Land and Houſes - - - - - -	£13,000,000
Profits on Trade and Profeſſions - - -	25,000,000

We believe, however, that at this period, the Property Tax on land was very imperfectly collected; the returns of rents being generally made according to the amount at which the premiſes were aſſeſſed to the Land Tax or Poor's Rates. By a ſubſequent amendment of the Act, the landholder is obliged to pay upon the rack rent; and the returns for the laſt year, when they are made up, will give an accurate ſtatement of the actual landed rental of the kingdom, which ſtill muſt be far ſhort of Mr. Spence's eſtimate.

† The taxes impoſed in France after the revolution were *la contribution fonciere* (the land tax), and *la taxe mobiliare* (a houſe tax, or rather a tax on goods and chattels). The former was intended to amount to $\frac{1}{5}$th of the nett produce of the land, but frequently amounted to $\frac{1}{3}$d, and in ſome inſtances even to $\frac{1}{2}$.

prietors, and enabled them to contribute ſo largely to the public revenue as they now do. It has raiſed the value of an acre of the beſt land, which Mr. Spence tells us in the times of the feudal ſyſtem, before the claſs of manufacturers was eſtabliſhed, was worth only 4 ſheep, to at leaſt 40 ſheep, or tenfold: for this mode of calculating by the price of proviſions puts the depreciation of money out of the queſtion, and is therefore an accurate ſtandard of value.

Mr. Spence lays it down as a principle, that "the nation "which exchanges a durable article for a periſhable one, "will ſoon grow poor, while the other nation will grow rich; "as the former will in a ſhort time have no veſtige remaining "of the luxuries imported and conſumed, while the articles "bought by the latter will ſtill be in exiſtence." Here again we differ from him. The great benefit of commerce to all nations, as Dr. Adam Smith obſerves, is, that "it carries off "that ſurplus part of the produce of their land and labour "for which there is no demand at home, and brings back in "return ſomething elſe for which there is a demand. It "gives value to their ſuperfluities, by exchanging them for "ſomething elſe, which may ſatisfy a part of their wants, "and increaſe their enjoyments*." Commerce thus keeps up that neceſſary circulation of the revenue of the proprietors of land, by adminiſtering to their luxuries (as in the inſtance Mr. Spence gives of our importing wine in exchange for hardware), on the neceſſity of which he has very ably expatiated. Indeed moſt of our manufactured articles are of a periſhable nature. Our woollens and our hardware, "moth and ruſt do corrupt;" and the value of all manufactures, even though not periſhable, is neceſſarily governed by the demand for them. Mr. Spence obſerves, "a nation which ſhould determine that all its "members ſhould do ſomething, and thus manufacture ten "times more than it could make uſe of, accumulating an "immenſe ſtock of pots and pans, of tables and chairs, would "be juſt about as wiſe, as a virtuoſo who ſhould collect all "the old hats and wigs he could lay his hands upon†." We perfectly agree with him in this obſervation, and therefore think that we act much more wiſely, in giving theſe ſuperfluous articles to our neighbours in exchange for good wine, than we ſhould do by hoarding them up in the manner he deſcribes. Nay, we go farther, and though we agree with him, that it is moſt deſirable to import articles of utility in ex-

---

* Wealth of Nations, book 4, chap. 1.

† Note, page 72.

change for our manufactures, yet we contend that rather than theſe manufactures ſhould lie upon our hands, they had better even be exchanged with France, agreeable to his extravagant ſuppoſition, "for that aeriform fluid called by chemiſts nitrous oxyde," if it could only be obtained from that country, and it was the faſhion here to inhale it. We contend this upon the ſame principle which Mr. Spence himſelf has advanced, that "the proſperity of the country "would be as much promoted, if an owner of an eſtate of "10,000*l* per annum were to expend this ſum in employing "500 men in blowing glaſs bubbles, to be broken as ſoon "as made, as if he employed the ſame number in building a "ſplendid palace." In both caſes the ſame end would be produced, of exchanging what would not be uſed at home for what would be uſed at home; thus furniſhing the manufacturing claſs with employment and ſubſiſtence, and averting the direful ruin which Mr. Spence tells us would at once enſue, "from the land proprietors withdrawing their re-"venue from the annual expenditure."

The objection ariſing to Mr. Spence's ſyſtem, from the increaſed demand for the products of the earth, and the conſequent increaſed cultivation and increaſed value of the land, which follow the increaſed number of manufacturers employed by commerce of export, is foreſeen, and thus evaded rather than obviated.

"I might admit the force of this objection, without invalidating, by ſuch a conceſſion, the truth of the concluſions previouſly drawn; ſince the *direct* creation of wealth by commerce, not its indirect influence on agriculture, is the opinion inſiſted upon by the diſciples of the mercantile ſect, the truth of which is here controverted."

Whether commerce be the cauſe of national wealth directly or indirectly, is not the queſtion; but whether it be the cauſe at all. That it is not, is the poſition which Mr. Spence has undertaken to maintain: but we find, by his own admiſſion, that "in Britain agriculture has thriven only in conſequence of the influence of manufactures, and that the increaſe of this influence is requiſite to its farther extenſion." As, then, our foreign commerce has increaſed our manufactures, which, by increaſing our population, have increaſed our agriculture, and thereby increaſed the value of rent to the landed proprietors, whoſe revenue conſtitute national wealth, our commerce has increaſed our national wealth; or, to uſe Mr. Spence's metaphor, it "is the moving power, which has

ſet in motion the wheels of the machine by which national wealth is created."

Mr. Spence then argues, that, "as the whole of the articles imported by foreign commerce are paid for by the conſumers at home, the manufacturers of the goods for exportation are indebted to theſe conſumers for their ſubſiſtence, and conſequently that the whole of the ſtimulus derived from manufactures which acts beneficially upon agriculture is inherent in ourſelves." But in order to diſprove the beneficial conſequences of commerce upon agriculture, Mr. Spence muſt make it appear that, if the landholders were not ſupplied with articles of luxury imported from abroad, they would conſume the manufactures made at home with which thoſe articles of luxury were purchaſed. Would every man buy two or three coats when he had only occaſion for one?—Would he, to uſe Mr. Spence's own words, "accumulate an immenſe ſtock of pots and pans, tables and chairs, for which he had no uſe?" Certainly not. Men are only tempted to part with their money for ſuch articles as contribute to their gratification, or to the ſupply of their wants, either real or imaginary. If this be ſo, and Mr. Spence aſſerts it ſo to be*, his argument falls to the ground, and the ſtimulus which acts beneficially upon agriculture, and increaſes the national wealth, is in a great degree derived from commerce.

Mr. Spence is aware of the inconvenience ariſing from the ſudden ceſſation of demand for any ſpecies of goods uſually diſpoſed of for exportation, and propoſes that the manufacturers thus deprived of their accuſtomed occupation ſhould be employed by the ſtate in making roads, canals, and other works of public utility. The neceſſary fund for this expence muſt be provided by additional taxation, which, he ſays, "we ſhould ſtill be able to bear, if we ceaſed to expend any part of our income in foreign products and luxuries, and had not at the ſame time increaſed our conſumption of home products and luxuries;" that is, if we adopted the ſyſtem of which he has already pointed out the direful conſequences, of withdrawing capital from the annual expenditure. Indeed, the due circulation of property in the political body reſembles the regular circulation of blood in the natural body,

---

"* Man is naturally ſelfiſh. The lords and land proprietors embraced with eagerneſs the opportunity offered to them, of devoting the ſurplus revenue which they were accuſtomed to conſume in ſupporting a crowd of dependants, to the purchaſe of manufactures of convenience or of elegance for their individual gratification."

and can alone diffuſe health and vigour to every member and organ of the frame.

Mr. Spence conſiders the inconveniences that we ſhould experience from the want of thoſe commodities with which we are now ſupplied by means of foreign commerce as very trifling; and contends that "the ſuperiority of our navy may be continued even if all our trade were this inſtant to ceaſe." As other nations maintain a ſtanding army in time of peace, ſo might we, he ſays, maintain a ſtanding navy, without reſorting to that nurſery of ſeamen,—our commerce. He obſerves, too, that we ſhould ſtill retain our coaſting trade, and that "this trade is of as much importance as all our other branches of commerce, collectively, as a nurſery for ſeamen." But a great part of our coaſting trade is derived from the tranſport of commodities, which either have been imported or are to be exported: if, therefore, our commerce were to ceaſe, our coaſting trade would be contracted within, comparatively, a very narrow compaſs: what remained would be principally the corn and coal trade. Now, a ſudden ſuſpenſion of the ſupply of theſe two neceſſary articles of life would, in a very ſhort time, create a famine, and conſequently, in all probability, an inſurrection, in the metropolis. If, therefore, this coaſting trade were the ſole dependance of government as a nurſery for ſeamen, on the breaking out of a war, either the navy muſt remain without men, or the metropolis be left without food and fuel. The preſent extent of our commerce enables government to man the navy without reſorting to ſuch violent extremities, or involving the nation in ſo dangerous a dilemma; and the drafts from our merchant ſhips are ſoon replaced by foreigners and apprentices. In time of peace, when wages are low, ſhip owners find it cheaper to pay ſeamen than to maintain apprentices, and therefore article no more than the law obliges them to carry; but when war takes place, and wages are doubled, they find it cheaper to maintain apprentices than to pay ſeamen, and therefore take a much greater number; who, at the expiration of the three years (during which they are protected by their indentures), are drafted into the navy, and again ſupplied in the merchant ſervice by new recruits. Thus war furniſhes the means of repairing the waſte it occaſions in the number of our ſeamen.

This difficulty being, however, ſmoothed over as well as the nature of the caſe will admit, we are told,

"It appears, then, in whatever point of view we regard commerce, that Britain is wholly independent of it. It contributes not

a ſixpence to her wealth, Its influence is not neceſſary for the promotion of her agriculture: but a very ſmall proportion of her neceſſaries are ſupplied from it; and her navy may be maintained without its aid."

Theſe bold aſſertions but ill accord with the previous admiſſion, "that the value of land is derived from manufactures"; for, that the increaſe of manufactures is derived from commerce, is a ſelf-evident propoſition. He then laments the "ſtrange obliquity of intellect" which perverſely maintains, that all our "wealth, power, and proſperity, are derived from commerce", on which he makes the following obſervations.

"This ſtrange obliquity of intellect can be explained in no other way than by adverting to the natural propenſity which there is in man to form his opinions by the examination of the mere ſurface of things, without ever aiming to penetrate to the remote and efficient cauſes of events. Becauſe Tyre, Venice, and Holland (ſtates without any extent of territory, and by being, in fact, the carriers merely of other nations), acquired riches by trade; and becauſe countries of much greater extent of ſoil, ſuch as Ruſſia, Poland, &c., without commerce, have been poor; we at once conclude that commerce is the only ſource of wealth, making no inquiry as to what other circumſtances, beſides the mere preſence or abſence of trade, may have contributed in the one caſe, to riches; in the other, to poverty. Becauſe we ſee merchants and ſhip owners heap up fortunes, whilſt men of landed property are often poor; becauſe mercantile towns increaſe in population and in ſplendour, whilſt villages remain ſtationary in theſe points; we conclude that wealth is created in towns by commerce only, not in the country by agriculture. Yet we do not form our opinions from ſuch a ſuperficial glance on many occaſions. We do not ſay, becauſe the government of this kingdom has a revenue of thirty or forty millions ſterling, that it *creates* wealth annually to this amount, and that, in conſequence, the only way to be rich is to increaſe taxes. We inquire from what ſource this revenue hae been derived; and, having learned that it comes from the pockets of the community, we determine,---that it is the governed, not the governors, who create this wealth. It is for want of making a ſimilar inveſtigation that we imagine all who get rich are the creators of riches. Our opinion, in fine, is thus erroneous; becauſe, in matters of political economy, we form our judgment from facts, which are but the ſurface mould of a mine of innumerable ſtrata, all of which muſt be penetrated before we can arrive at the truth we are in ſearch of."

Mankind have in all ages been apt to judge from the evidence of their ſenſes; and the inſtances of Tyre, Venice, and

Holland, on the one hand, and Ruſſia and Poland on the other, might well lead them to draw the concluſion which he laments. Arguments are only of uſe to guide the mind where facts are wanting; and men of plain underſtanding, while they ſee that riches and commerce are inſeparable from each other, will believe that there is ſome natural connection between them, notwithſtanding all that can be ſaid to perſuade them to the contrary. The ſetting up deep reaſoning in oppoſition to common ſenſe is admirably ridiculed by Sterne; and the paſſage is ſo appropriate to the preſent caſe, that we cannot but quote it. Uncle Toby, after hearing all the ſubtle arguments, on which the lawyers and civilians had decided that "the mother is not of kin to her child," obſerves, "let the learned ſay what they will, there muſt certainly have been ſome ſort of conſanguinity betwixt the Ducheſs of Suffolk and her ſon." "The vulgar are of the ſame opinion," quoth Yorick, "to this very hour."

After ſome exultation on the comfortable diſcovery, that "Britain is truly independent; that her reſources, the cauſe of her wealth and proſperity, are intrinſic, inherent in herſelf, and cannot be influenced by any thing external"; and beſtowing ſome little commiſeration on the reſt of the nations of Europe, and the Americans, who are under the deluſion of this falſe opinion, that "our riches and our greatneſs are derived from our commerce," Mr. Spence, though he ſays he has already amply proved that commerce could not poſſibly contribute one ſhilling to our national wealth, goes back again to prove this fact, more particularly as to our commerce with our colonies; after which he ſeems to ſuſpect that ſome of us may ſtill retain a little hankering. By way of preamble, he adviſes us, as we value our own happineſs, not to conſider them as ſources of wealth; for thoſe in the Weſt Indies muſt be ſpeedily expected to follow the example of St. Domingo: and as to thoſe in the Eaſt, he conſiders it "impoſſible that a few thouſand Engliſhmen can retain a population of 30 or 40 millions of natives in ſubjection"; but gives us the conſolatory aſſurance, that, "if they were all loſt tomorrow, it would, in a national point of view, be of no importance to us." It is admitted, that, "if the greater part of our colonial produce were ſold with a profit to foreign nations, and if this profit were drawn either in gold or ſilver, or in any other wealth, into the mother country, we ſhould then gain an acceſſion of wealth equal to this amount from the colonies." Judging by this criterion, we can exactly aſcertain the annual value of the Weſt India colonies to the

mother country; for in Sir Wm. Young's Weſt India Common Place Book, a valuable compilation of official documents laid before Parliament reſpecting thoſe colonies, we find (page 86,) that the annual exports of their produce from Great Britain to foreign nations, at the prices in 1804-5, are as under:

Sugar 1,386,289 - 57s 0*d* - 3,950,924*l*
Rum 1,059,269 gals. 3 9½ - 202,243
Coffee 193,445 - 120 6 - 1,165,520 or 5,318,687*l*.

Which, by the author's own admiſſion, is an acceſſion of ſo much wealth to the mother country.

Mr. Spence makes a moſt extraordinary aſſertion, that "as it is with the capital of Britiſh ſubjects that the Weſt India iſlands are cultivated, Great Britain muſt eventually pay the whole coſt of bringing their produce to market, and conſequently ſhe cannot gain more profit by this trade than the Weſt India proprietor gains." Now it appears to us, on the contrary, that Great Britain may, and at preſent actually does, gain a very large profit by this trade, while the planter gains nothing; and that the greater the proportion taken by government of the price for which his commodities ſell, the leſs will be left for the proprietor. For example, the average price of ſugar during the laſt year, as appears by the returns in the gazette, was about 33s, excluſive of duty. It farther appears from the report of the committee of the Houſe of Commons on the commercial ſtate of the Weſt India colonies, that the average charges in the Weſt Indies attaching to the ſugar crop, over and above the proceeds of the rum, amount to 20s 10d per cwt.; and that the average charges in Great Britain attaching to the ſale of that commodity, ſuch as freight, inſurance, commiſſion, &c. amount to 16s per cwt. Thus the planters of ſugar actually loſt part of their capital laſt year, while the nation derived a revenue of more than three millions from the fruits of their induſtry, in the duty on that commodity. Mr. Spence will ſay, that this duty being paid by the conſumers, is no acceſſion of national wealth; but we contend, that it has in this inſtance been eventually *ſaved* by the conſumer, and *paid* by the planter, in the depreciated and inadequate price at which he has been obliged to ſell his ſugar. Mr Spence himſelf admits the benefits ariſing to the nation from the export of her manufactures to the Weſt Indies, while the planter, ſo far from deriving any benefit whatever, has ſuſtained a heavy loſs. This is ſurely a full refutation of the paradoxical propoſition, "that

Great Britain cannot gain more profit by this trade than the Weſt India proprietor gains."

A few obſervations follow on the nature of our Eaſt India commerce; in which one of the old arguments is repeated, and brings Mr. Spence to the following concluſion.

"Thus, then, in every point of view, it appears, that this nation derives no wealth from its colonial commerce, any more than from any other branch of commerce; and hence, although there is certainly no reaſon why we ſhould give up our colonies, ſo long as we can preſerve them without any enormous expence, yet we may diſmiſs from our minds all fear and anxiety as to our future poſſeſſion of them. If we are deprived of them by the occurrence of events, out of our power to controul, we have, for our conſolation, the reflection, that they are by no means eſſential to our well being; and, that as our wealth has increaſed ſince the loſs of the moſt important of our colonies, North America, ſo it certainly would continue to increaſe, though we had not an inch of territory on the globe, beſides our own favoured iſland.

"Many other conſiderations naturally ariſe out of this ſubject, but the limits which I have preſcribed to myſelf forbid any further extenſion of my remarks. I ſhall have attained the end which I had in view, in writing theſe obſervations, if even a few of my countrymen are induced by them to give up the humiliating and degrading opinion, that Britain,—of all the nations that ever exiſted, the moſt rich and proſperous,—is indebted for her proſperity to the powers around her, and dependent for a continuance of theſe bleſſings on the caprice of one ſet of cuſtomers, or the tyranny of another:—if even a very ſmall proportion of my readers are led by the arguments here adduced, to participate with me in the gratifying conviction, that our wealth and our greatneſs are wholly derived from our own reſources, and independent of every thing external; and that, though Britain, according to Bſhop Berkley's idea, were ſurrounded with a wall of braſs, ten thouſand cubits in height, ſtill ſhe would as far excel the reſt of the nations of the globe in riches, as ſhe now does both in this ſecondary quality, and in the more important ones of freedom, virtue, and ſcience."

This work is evidently the reſult of much labour, and is written with conſiderable ingenuity. The author, like moſt men who endeavour to eſtabliſh erroneous principles, has in ſome paſſages made admiſſions which contradict his own deductions; and in others has ſlurred over, rather than fairly met, arguments which make againſt his ſyſtem. He has put propoſitions hypothetically, which he could not put poſitively*. He ſeems in ſome inſtances to have confuſed himſelf

* "Might have conſumed to the ſame amount of home manufac-

by the ſubtlety of his own reaſoning*. He condemns mankind for forming their judgment on facts, which are, he ſays, "but the ſurface mould of a mine of innumerable ſtrata, all of which muſt be penetrated before we can arrive at the truth we are in ſearch of." He appears determined on all occaſions to "penetrate into every ſtratagem of the mine [mind] which conceals the grand truths of political economy;" and ſometimes, we think, bewilders himſelf in its depths, groping in vain after that truth which actually lay upon the ſurface.

Paradoxes and novelties ſtrike the mind, and the revival of exploded doctrines in a new form will probably excite ſome attention, and gain ſome proſelytes, particularly as they are urged in a tone of lofty confidence, and recommended by profeſſions of the moſt patriotic motives. We can however ſee nothing in this work to ſhake the following poſition with which Dr. Smith commences the introduction to his treatiſe on the Wealth of Nations: "The annual labour of each nation is the fund which originally ſupplies it with all the neceſſaries and conveniencies of life which it annually conſumes, and which conſiſt always, either in the immediate produce of that labour, or in what is purchaſed with that produce from other nations." Labour, then, whether directed to agriculture, manufactures, or commerce, is the ſource of national wealth; but that agriculture is of ſuperior importance to manufactures and commerce, is as evident as that the neceſſaries are more valuable than the conveniencies and comforts of life. So far from proving that commerce is not productive of wealth, Mr. Spence has admitted, that by extending manufactures and encouraging population, it increaſes agriculture, from which, according to his ſyſtem, all national wealth is derived; and he has ſcarcely brought forward a ſhadow of argument in ſupport of his aſſertion, that commerce is uſeleſs to our glory, greatneſs, and proſperity. In our opinion, he has totally failed in proving the truth of the theory he has attempted to eſtabliſh; and, though his work may be conſidered as a curious ſpeculative treatiſe, it has no practical utility, and therefore is not en-

---

tures." (Page 36.) Inſtances of the preceding aſſertions have already been given.

* "Gold and ſilver are undoubtedly wealth, yet they are but a ſmall portion of what has properly a claim to that title, and a nation that has abundance of gold and ſilver is, in fact, not richer than if it had none." (Page 14.) Thus a nation which poſſeſſes what is undoubtedly wealth, is in fact not richer than if it had none of this wealth!!!

titled to that importance which he claims for it, from a reference to the preſent political ſituation of the country.

Although we differ from Mr. Spence in his leading principle, that "agriculture is the ſole ſource, commerce and manufactures no ſource at all, of our national wealth," yet we are far from meaning to deny that great practical good may reſult from the ſerious conſideration of ſome inferences which neceſſarily follow his ſtatements. If commerce and manufactures have taken the lead where they ought to follow, if agriculture has not been able to keep pace with them in the rapidity of their advances, our ſituation requires the provident interference of the legiſlature; for a country at war with all her neighbours certainly ought not to be in any degree dependent upon them for her means of ſubſiſtence. We doubt, however, whether this is really our caſe. The ſcarcity of any commodity is an evil which has a natural tendency to correct itſelf. In conſequence of the high price of corn in the years 1800 and 1801, large tracts of land were incloſed and cultivated, probably ſufficient to provide for the whole population of the empire; for though our foreign ſupplies have now been cut off for nearly twelve months paſt, the price of corn has not advanced. The diminution of our export trade will oblige many of the labouring claſs, who were formerly employed in manufactures, to ſeek employment in agriculture, and thus tend ſtill farther to reſtore the equilibrium between the quantity of labour directed to theſe different occupations.

So far from thinking with Mr. Spence that the ſtate of ſociety would be improved if the "peaſant, no longer anxious about the means of providing bread for his family, might devote his abundant leiſure to the cultivation of his mind," we are of opinion, that idleneſs, in the lower claſſes of the community, is the ſource of all poſſible vice, and its attendant miſery. We conſider that ſtate of ſociety as the moſt virtuous and happy, and as approaching neareſt to the moſt conſummate perfection of which any human inſtitution is capable, where every member of the community may ſecure an independent maintenance by induſtry. If that proportion of the population, which the land, though it can maintain, cannot employ, were deprived of their preſent occupations in manufactures and commerce, the great *vis medicatrix rei publicæ*, the hope which animates every man in this favoured land, of bettering his ſituation in life, and the exertions which ariſe out of that hope, would be at an end. That gangrene, idleneſs, would both debaſe and corrupt their minds; poverty and dependance would be their inevitable doom; the

great landholders, who alone would poſſeſs the means of giving them bread to eat, would draw crowds of dependants around them, as menial ſervants and military retainers, and thus the old feudal ſyſtem would again be eſtabliſhed.

It muſt be acknowledged, that in conſequence of the extent of our manufactures, we are expoſed to inconſiderable inconvenience in caſe of a rupture with the powers who are our principal cuſtomers; but as the beneficial influence of manufactures upon agriculture is admitted by Mr. Spence himſelf, this is no argument why we ſhould diſcontinue them. As well might we renounce any other of the advantages or bleſſings of life, on account of the uncertainty of their continuance; or as well might we extirpate from our jaws the grinders with which we maſticate our daily food, in order to ſecure ourſelves againſt a temporary fit of the tooth ache. Beſides, Mr Spence obſerves, that the articles with which we furniſh other nations are chiefly neceſſaries, while thoſe which we receive in return are principally luxuries. We may therefore reſt pretty confident, that they will deviſe means, direct or indirect, to procure their accuſtomed ſupply, notwithſtanding the arbitrary decrees of their deſpot. If Great Britain were to confine her manufactures within the bounds neceſſary for her own conſumption, and renounce all foreign commerce, the great ſources of her diſpoſable revenue would be dried up; ſhe might indeed be independent, but ſhe muſt ceaſe to be great.

Some of the obſervations in this work are calculated to irritate the landholders againſt the merchants and manufacturers. It is ſaid, that "the landholders have been completely duped by the intereſted cry of the exporting manufacturer." "No wonder, (Mr. Spence adds,) that the woollen manufacturers ſhould get rich, when the landed proprietors have in one hundred and fifty years made them a preſent of two to three hundred millions ſterling." To juſtify this aſſertion, he ſhould have ſhewn that wool would have fetched ſo much higher a price in foreign markets than in Great Britain; and that the manufacturers, not the community at large, are the parties benefited by the law which prohibits the exportation of wool. It ſeems reaſonable to ſuppoſe that all commodities will fetch the beſt price where the moſt extenſive manufactures for their conſumption are eſtabliſhed; and were this prohibition removed, the grazier would not be benefited, for Great Britain actually imports foreign wools in large quantities. But admitting this to be otherwiſe, the cheaper the manufacturers buy, the cheaper they ſell, from the competition which ſubſiſts between them; and the advantage,

therefore, of the reduced price of wool would be to the public, not to themſelves: while Mr. Spence complains ſo loudly of this "irrational, impolitic, and unjuſt meaſure," and talks of the monopolies, reſtrictions, and bounties, in favour of commerce and manufactures, he is totally ſilent upon the ſubject of the bounty on the exportation of Britiſh corn, and the duty on the importation of foreign corn, which were granted for the encouragement of Britiſh agriculture, and amply counterbalance all the advantages given to manufactures and commerce. But the fact is, that all theſe various regulations have been adopted by the legiſlature from political conſiderations, and not from motives of partiality to the intereſts of either of theſe parties. The merchants in all nations accord with the ſentiments delivered by thoſe of France to Mr. Colbert, who, when he aſked them what he could do to ſerve them, replied, "Leave us to ourſelves." That many of theſe regulations affect the intereſt of the home conſumer is obvious; and the reaſon is equally obvious, that Great Britain, in all her commercial arrangements, has made the increaſe of national wealth a ſubordinate object to the increaſe of national revenue, and the eſtabliſhment of naval power. Sir Joſhua Child obſerves, that "the navigation laws operate in prejudice to that competition of free and open admiſſion of ſhips from whatever quarter, which would make a raw material cheaper, and facilitate and cheapen the paſſage to market of the material manufactured; and that this muſt in ſome degree lower the profits and check the induſtry of a laborious and ingenious people ſuch as thoſe of Great Britain." It appears therefore that merchants have complained of theſe reſtrictions, inſtead of adviſing them; but the object of the legiſlature in enforcing them has been repeatedly declared, and uniformly adhered to. The 4th of Henry VII laid the foundation of this ſyſtem; and after reciting that "great miniſhing and decay hath been now of late time of the navy of this realm of England, and idleneſs of mariners within the ſame, ſo that this noble realm, within ſhort proceſs of time, without reformation be had therein, ſhall not be of ability nor of ſtrength to defend itſelf," enacts that "no perſon inhabitant of this realm, other than merchant-ſtrangers, ſhall ſhip in any foreign veſſels, out or home or coaſtways, and that no wines, &c. ſhall be brought from France, but in ſhips whereof the King or his liege ſubjects are owners, and the maſters and mariners of the ſame, Engliſh, Iriſh, or Welſh, or men of Berwick upon Tweed." During the protectorate of Oliver Cromwell, a law was paſſed, providing, that "no goods ſhould be imported into England in foreign ſhips, ſaving of the growth and pro-

duce of the countries to which ſuch ſhips belonged;" and prohibiting all foreign ſhips whatever from trading to the Britiſh plantations in America; which completed the maritime ſyſtem as now eſtabliſhed, of employing the greateſt poſſible number of Britiſh mercantile ſhipping, manned with Britiſh ſeamen, as a reſource for naval ſervice in time of war. The wiſdom and policy of this ſyſtem have been too firmly eſtabliſhed, by experience and the evidence of facts, to be ſhaken by argument. On her extenſive commerce, more particularly on that with her colonial poſſeſſions, the continuance of which cannot be interrupted by the decrees of her enemy, Great Britain has founded that naval pre-eminence, which enables her to maintain the ſovereignty of the ocean againſt the world in arms; and to ſhew the deſpot of Europe, that he and all his dependant nations are but her tributaries, by exacting reſources from their commerce to carry on that war which originated in his injuſtice, inſults, and aggreſſions.

The invidious and unneceſſary reflections on the manufacturing and commercial claſſes are the moſt exceptionable part of this book, and are peculiarly reprehenſible at the preſent criſis, when unanimity is ſo highly neceſſary. They are calculated to excite animoſities, ſimilar to thoſe which once exiſted between the Patricians and the Plebeians in the Roman republic. Theſe animoſities were on one occaſion happily appeaſed by Menenius Agrippa, whoſe fable of the belly and the members may juſtly be applied to ſhew the folly of any ſchiſm between the landed and the commercial intereſts; for as the functions of the body can only be carried on by the mutual co-operation of all its parts, ſo can the functions of the ſtate only be properly diſcharged by the mutual co-operation of all claſſes of the community.

Sir J. C. Hippiſley's Intended *Speech.*

[Continued from page 292 of volume xxviii.]

IN our former obſervations on this pamphlet we exhibited to the public the leading tenets of the Romiſh Church, as founded in its general councils, and their uniformly baneful effects on ſociety; and we proved from the infallibility of theſe general councils, and from the poſitive aſſertions of ſome modern Romiſh divines, that they could not admit of any alteration or improvement.

In page 4, Sir J. C. H. contradicts Doctor Duigenan's aſſertions on this point, without any one argument to invali-

date them, except the aſſurances of Doctor Troy and other Popiſh prelates, that the doctrines of Popery had no exiſtence, and were mere *bugbears*. But we proved that Doctor Troy, in his Paſtoral Letter of 1793, contradicted, in the moſt poſitive manner, his aſſurances made to Sir J. C. H. in the year 1805, and inſiſted, in various parts of it, that they are infallible, and that they never can undergo any change. The woeful ſtate of Ireland from the year 1793, when that work was publiſhed, to the year 1798, having been diſgraced by the groſs perjuries of its Popiſh inhabitants, by treaſonable conſpiracies, inſurrections and maſſacres, affords melancholy proofs of the truth of Doctor Troy's aſſertions, made in his Paſtoral Letter of 1793. Sir J. C. H. reſts his chief arguments, for granting to Romaniſts an equal ſhare of political power with Proteſtants, "on the very great portion of the former in the extended population of Great Britain and Ireland, not leſs than one-fourth (as he ſays); on the immenſe number of them ſerving in our fleets and armies, which he ſtates at *two hundred thouſand*," and on an exaggerated ſtatement of their numbers in Ireland, compared to its Proteſtant inhabitants.

We ſhall proceed to prove how ill informed he is on theſe points.

Sir William Petty ſurveyed the whole kingdom of Ireland with great accuracy, as appears by his very excellent map, in the ſurveyor general's office in Dublin, ſhortly before the reſtoration in 1660. In his Political Anatomy, he ſtates the whole population of Ireland, in 1672, ſixteen years antecedent to the commencement of the revolution war, to be one million one hundred thouſand.

Dean Swift, in his Draper's Letters, publiſhed in 1724, aſſerts, that the inhabitants of Ireland, according to the largeſt computation, amounted to one million and a half. In 1732, an enumeration of the inhabitants of Ireland was made by order of government, and they were found to be under two millions.

Mr. Buſhe, a member of the Iriſh Houſe of Commons, has given an account of the number of houſes in Ireland, calculated from the hearth-money books in 1791, and from other documents, for enumerating the inhabitants of Ireland.

Mr. Chalmers, from the documents publiſhed by Mr. Buſhe, calculates the number of the inhabitants of Ireland, in 1791, to amount to four millions two hundred thouſand; and he deduces from thence, that they have been nearly quadrupled in the courſe of one hundred years ſince the re-

volution. (See Chalmers's Eſtimate, pp. 222, 223). With this calculation we cannot agree, for the following reaſons:

1ſt. Mr. Chalmers, who has taken great pains to aſcertain the population of England and Wales, computes it, at the time of the revolution, to have amounted to nearly ſeven millions*; and in the year 1794, to amount to nearly eight millions and a half†, and, conſequently, that the population of England and Wales has increaſed only one million and a half in one hundred years. In his quotation from Mr. Wallace, it is laid down, that the diſtreſſed circumſtances of mankind, diſabling them to provide for a family, check very greatly the increaſe of population‡: and he ſtates, that when England was a country of ſhepherds and warriors, ſhe was inconſiderable in numbers; that when manufactures found their way into the country, when huſbandmen gradually acquired greater ſkill, and when the ſpirit of commerce univerſally prevailed, people, as it were, grew out of the earth, amidſt convulſions, famine, and warfare; that England can ſcarcely be regarded as a manufacturing and commercial country at the revolution, when contraſted with her preſent proſperity in trade and manufacture§. Ireland, during the whole period from the revolution to the preſent day, when manufactures are little more than in their dawn, that dawn commencing only in the year 1782, when the ſhackles on her trade were removed, may be ſaid to have been a country of ſhepherds and warriors. The whole of Ireland, part of the province of Ulſter excepted, in which the linen manufacture has for ſome years flouriſhed, having been almoſt deſtitute of manufactures and agriculture, and inhabited chiefly by herdſmen; a peaſantry as poor and miſerable as any in Europe, for want of employment; and always furniſhing the armies of foreign potentates, as well as thoſe of Great Britain, with multitudes of ſoldiers; and other nations, but particularly America, with emigrants; England, at the ſame time, conſtantly increaſing ſo much in manufactures and commerce, that the want of hands to carry them on is often complained of. From all which, we think it not only improbable, but impoſſible, that Ireland can have quadrupled her population ſince the revolution, and that England and Wales ſhould not, in the ſame ſpace of time, have increaſed their population even by one-fourth.

2dly. We think the calculation made by Mr. Chalmers,

---

* Eſtimate, p. 58. † Ibid. 220. ‡ Eſtimate, p. 221.
§ Eſtimate, pp. 212, 213.

from the documents afforded by Mr. Buſhe, of the number in each houſe, viz. ſix perſons to a houſe of one hearth, is too great; as not more than four, if ſo many, ſhould be allowed. The inhabitants of ſuch houſes cannot be ſuppoſed to maintain ſervants. They conſiſt of a man, his wife and children, when fully inhabited; and often of widows and children. Perſons who occupy ſuch houſes commonly ſend off their children as ſervants, or labourers, to gain a ſubſiſtence, as from their extreme poverty they are not able to maintain a family.

3dly. We are inclined to think that there is ſome groſs error in the calculation of the number of houſes in Ireland, and that they are much below Mr. Buſhe's computation of them.

4thly. The ſuperficial contents of Great Britain are, to thoſe of Ireland, in the proportion of three and a half to one. We conceive, from an inſpection of the maps, that the ſuperficial contents of Scotland, with its iſlands, are nearly the ſame with thoſe of Ireland; perhaps they exceed them a little: England and Wales muſt be, therefore, much more than twice as large as Ireland. If England and Wales have mountains and waſtes, Ireland has them in a much greater degree, and bogs, lakes, and moraſſes infinitely more extenſive. In the inhabited parts of the two iſlands, the populouſneſs of England and Wales exceeds that of Ireland in a very great ratio. We appeal to every intelligent man, who has travelled through both countries, whether the local population of England and Wales be not much greater than that of Ireland. We conceive that Mr. Chalmers, whoſe accurate reſearches and judgment do him infinite honour, never travelled through Ireland, particularly through the provinces of Connaught, Leinſter, and Munſter; if he had, he never could have been induced to believe that Ireland contained upwards of four millions of inhabitants, and England and Wales only double that number. We will venture to aſſert, either that the calculation of the number of inhabitants of England and Wales is much underrated (which is the fact), or that the number of inhabitants in Ireland is very much exaggerated; and that if the latter contains four millions, the former cannot contain leſs than twelve millions. We have a more favourable opinion of the accuracy of Mr. Chalmers than that of Mr. Buſhe; and the former has founded all his inferences on this ſubject on the erroneous data of the latter. Some Iriſh gentlemen, who have aſſumed the title of patriots, have exaggerated the ſtrength and importance of Ireland for the purpoſe of bearding England, and particularly the United Iriſhmen and their coadjutors—the advocates of Popery.

A member of the former, not long ſince, publiſhed a pamphlet in Dublin, relating to the health of the citizens, and the means of preſerving it, in which he tranſiently aſſerts, that its population amounts to four hundred thouſand; though the Rev. Mr. Whitelaw, now a beneficed clergyman in Dublin, made an enumeration of them, formed from perſonal viſitation of every houſe and ſtreet, and he ſtates its population at one hundred and ſeventy thouſand, with a ſmall fraction. On the whole, we are decidedly of opinion, that the whole inhabitants of Ireland do not exceed three millions.

We ſhall now proceed to examine the relative numbers of Proteſtants and Papiſts in Ireland. Sir William Petty, in his "Political Anatomy," ſtates the proportion of them in Ireland to be as three to eight, in the year 1672, ſixteen years before the revolution, ſo that at that time the Proteſtants amounted to no more than one-third of the inhabitants of the country. In the year 1732, an accurate enumeration was made, by order of government, of all the families in Ireland, diſtinguiſhing the Proteſtants from thoſe of the Popiſh in each province; and from thence a calculation was made of the relative numbers of each perſuaſion in Ireland. It was publiſhed in Dublin in 1736, and reprinted in 1788. It appears from this very accurate calculation, made in the year 1732, that the number of Proteſtant inhabitants was, to that of the Popiſh, in the proportion of two and a half to one. Doctor Burke, Romiſh titular biſhop of Oſſory, wrote a book in Latin, entitled, "Hibernia Dominicana," the firſt part of which was publiſhed in 1762, the ſecond in 1772. In this he ſtates, that an enumeration was made of the number of Proteſtants and Papiſts in Ireland, in 1731, and that the former amounted to 700,453, the latter to 1,030,968. Thus it appears, that according to Doctor Burke, the proportion in 1731 was not quite two to one; and it cannot be doubted, but that he would be inclined to exaggerate the number of his own votaries. He laments, in his Hibernia Dominicana, the great increaſe of the Proteſtants, and the diminution of the Romaniſts, ſince the year 1731; for he ſays, that the opulent members of his communion have been converted by the penal laws, and the lower claſs in whole troops (*turmatim*) by the charter ſchools. The Popery code, which continued in full force to the year 1776, joined to the operation of the charter ſchools, muſt have increaſed the proportion on the Proteſtant ſide.

The return of the number of paupers of each perſuaſion

admitted into the Houſe of Induſtry is a document which muſt have great weight in determining this queſtion.

This houſe is a charitable inſtitution, for the reception of beggars of every religious perſuaſion, who reſort to Dublin from all parts of Ireland, for there are no poor rates there. It appears by a return of the beggars admitted into it, for ſix years, that the Romaniſts in it did not exceed the Proteſtants in the proportion of three to one.

Numbers Admitted.

	Proteſtants.	Papiſts.
In 1784	696	1870
In 1785	768	2435
In 1786	1794	2912
In 1787	1403	3841
In 1788	854	3643
In 1789	798	3615
Sum total	6313	17,816

The Houſe of Induſtry is filled with the loweſt claſs; and as the property of the Proteſtants is infinitely ſuperior to that of the Romaniſts*, the number of paupers muſt be much greater on the ſide of the latter; beſides, as wandering beggars flock to Dublin from all parts of Ireland, it is to be conſidered that the feweſt come from the northern counties, in which Proteſtants predominate; for having a flouriſhing manufacture, and ſuperior habits of induſtry, they ſend forth feweſt beggars. We will appeal to thoſe who are well acquainted with Ireland, whether there is not much more mendicity in either of the provinces of Leinſter, Munſter, or Connaught, than in Ulſter, which contains the Proteſtant counties. The Catholic committee, convened in Dublin in 1792, firſt aſſerted, that their votaries exceeded the Proteſtants in the proportion of three to one, and that the groſs number of the inhabitants of Ireland amounted to four millions. As that committee formed the plan of the dreadful rebellion which broke out in 1798, and which had for its object the complete exciſion of Proteſtants of every deſcription, and the ſeparation of their native country from England, they magnified the number of their fellow religioniſts, in order to inſpire them with certain hopes of ſucceeding in their deſigns. Previous to the repeal of the penal laws, which evidently encouraged them to form thoſe treaſonable ma-

* The landed property of the Proteſtants, compared to that of the Papiſts, is in the proportion of ninety-nine to one.

chinations, they rated their numbers at but *two millions.* In the debate on Mr. Gardiner's bill, in the Iriſh Houſe of Commons, for repealing the bulk of the penal laws in 1782, Mr. Grattan ſtated, as his reaſons for making further conceſſions to the Iriſh Catholics, "as the moſt likely means of obtaining a victory over the *prejudices of Catholics,* and our own," he gave his conſent to Mr. G.'s bill, "becauſe he would not keep *two millions* of his fellow-ſubjects in a ſtate of ſlavery." Mr. Grattan, the great advocate of the Romaniſts, was ſuppoſed to have a more perfect knowledge of the ſtate of his native country than any other perſon. Doctor Butler, titular archbiſhop of Caſhell, in his letter to Mr. Ord, of March 1ſt, 1787, repreſents the propriety of removing the remaining links of the ſhackles of the penal laws from *two millions* of his Majeſty's ſubjects. When the Roman Catholics addreſſed the Duke of Clarence at Cork, in 1787, they ſpeak of the loyalty of *two millions* of their order in Ireland in their addreſs. For the purpoſe of ſhewing how fatal to the peace and ſecurity of Ireland the groſs ignorance of Engliſh ſtateſmen of its real ſtate has been, we ſhall give Mr. Fox's opinion on the repeal of the penal laws, delivered in the Houſe of Commons in 1782.

"That *the inteſtine diviſions of that country were no more*:* the religious prejudices of former ages were forgotten, and the Roman Catholics, reſtored to the rights of men and citizens, would become an acceſſion of ſtrength and wealth to the empire. Upon the whole, he was convinced that the Iriſh deſired nothing more ardently, than proper grounds for being moſt *cordially united to Great Britain,* and *he was ſure they would be attached to this country even to bigotry.*" His wiſhes in favour of the Roman Catholics have been not only fulfilled but exceeded; but his hopes and expectations have been diſappointed.

From the fair ſtatement which we have given of the probable number of inhabitants in Great Britain and Ireland reſpectively, the reader will readily perceive the groſs error of Sir J. C. Hippiſley, in aſſerting that more than one-half of the perſons ſerving in our fleets and armies are Iriſh Romaniſts.

---

* The penal laws kept the Iriſh Papiſts quiet. The fatal errors of this great ſtateſman ſhould be a ſalutary admonition to Sir J. C. Hippiſley, who has advanced ſo many raſh and ill-founded opinions on the ſtate of Ireland.

The number of ſailors, including 29,000 marines voted for the year 1806, was - - - -	120,000
The number of ſoldiers voted for the ſame year was - - - - - - - - -	134,473
Total	254,473

The tonnage of the ſhipping of Great Britain and Ireland in 1806, was - - - -	2,263,714
In this groſs calculation the tonnage of Ireland was but - - - - - - - -	55,545

The reader may deduce from this what may probably be the number of Iriſh ſailors, compared to Engliſh, ſerving in the navy; and it is to be conſidered that many of the former are Proteſtants.

As to the Iriſh ſoldiers ſerving in the imperial army of the line, it is univerſally well known that four-fifths of them are raiſed in the Proteſtant counties of Ulſter. Thoſe who are concerned in the recruiting ſervice reſort to them in the firſt inſtance, as a matter of courſe, becauſe they know that they can raiſe more men in one of the manufacturing towns of the north, on account of their great population, than in an entire county of any of the three other provinces; in which the prieſts, it is well known, endeavour to prevent any of their flock from enliſting in the King's ſervice. Sir J. C. H. ſays, in page 69, that "in many regiments of the line the Catholics form a very large majority, extending even to two-thirds." This is founded merely on his dictum, and we have proved ſo many of his aſſertions on this ſubject to be unfounded, that little reliance can be placed on them. We can appeal to every perſon well acquainted with the ſtate of his Majeſty's army, whether his ſtatement is not groſsly erroneous. The volunteers required from the militia of England and Scotland this year are 31,000, thoſe from Ireland but 7,000; and many of the latter are Proteſtants. On the whole, the reader muſt perceive how prepoſterous Sir J. C. H.'s ſtatement is, when he aſſerts that there are 200,000 Iriſh Roman Catholics in our army and navy, as the whole of our ſailors and ſoldiers voted that year did not exceed 254,473.

In anſwer to Doctor Duigenan's obſervation, that Catholics hold oaths taken to heretics to be null and void, Sir J. C. H. inſiſts on the contrary, and aſſerts, "that every catechiſm and every expoſition of the Roman Catholic doctrine enjoins a ſcrupulous obſervance of an oath." We have already proved, that ſuch obligations are declared not to be binding

by the general councils and the canon law of the Romish Church, and by many Papal bulls and epistles. We shall here adduce some more instances of it. Innocent III absolved King John's subjects from their oaths of allegiance in the thirteenth century. In 1281, Martin V declared all leagues, confederacies, or engagements, entered into by any sovereign princes with Michael Paliologus, Emperor of Constantinople, to be null and void, even though confirmed *by an oath.* In the fifteenth century, Vladislaus, King of Hungary, made peace with Amerath, Emperor of the Turks, and they bound themselves mutually by an oath to adhere to it; but Pope Eugenius IV persuaded Vladislaus to violate it, *because, as he said, no faith was to be kept with heretics.*, He accordingly obeyed the Pope's mandate.

A destructive war of thirty years between the Protestant and Popish princes of Germany was concluded by the peace of Westphalia, in the year 1648. They bound themselves mutually to the observance of it by an oath; but the Pope pronounced the oath to be null and void, as it was made to heretics. In the preliminaries of the treaty of Utrecht, between the Emperor and Lewis XIV, it was agreed, that the Protestants of Germany should enjoy the free exercise of their religion, and all the privileges which had been secured to them by the peace of Westphalia. The Pope having heard of it, declared the treaty to be null and void, even though confirmed *by an oath.* In all the Papal bulls and epistles published in Ireland, to promote the rebellions which prevailed there in the reigns of Elizabeth, James I, and Charles I, plenary indulgence and a full remission of their sins were granted to all such Catholics as should take up arms to extirpate heretics, and they were declared to be discharged from their oath of allegiance*. In the bull of Pope Urban VIII, dated at Rome the 25th of May, 1643, the following indulgence is granted, "to all and every one of the faithful Christians, in the foresaid kingdom of Ireland, now, and for the time, militating against the heretics, and other enemies of the Catholic faith, from all sins, trespasses, transgressions, crimes, and delinquencies, how heinous and atrocious soever they be, not omitting those very enormities in the most peculiar cases, which by any whatsoever former constitution of ours, or of our predecessors, were designed *to be reserved to the ordinary or apostolic See,* from all which

* This took place in England during Elizabeth's reign.

the confeſſor ſhall hereby have power granted him to abſolve the foreſaid Catholics" The maſs of the Iriſh Papiſts paid no regard to an oath of allegiance in the rebellion of 1798; nay, in many places they, headed by their prieſts, a ſhort time before its exploſion, ſolicited the civil magiſtrate to adminiſter oaths of allegiance to them, at the altar of their reſpective chapels; and they afterwards uniformly violated them*. It is moſt certain that they practiſed this diſſimulation, for no other purpoſe but to lull the government into a ſtate of ſupine and dangerous ſecurity; and it had the deſired effect. When the rebellion was over, father Byrne, a Wexford prieſt, wrote a letter the 30th of April, 1799, to Mr. Donovan, an eminent attorney in Dublin, complaining of the cruel treatment which he received from his biſhop, Doctor Caulfield, even after he had received the King's pardon; and in this he ſays, "inſtead of excommunicating them (the rebels) for their horrid rebellion, he gave them his benediction, in the chapel yard, the day they took Wexford, and two days before they called on me to follow them. Inſtead of excommunicating the barbarous murderers of Scullabogue, he gave his prieſts power to give abſolution *for murder*, a power which ever till then he reſerved to himſelf †."

Thomas Cleary, the poſtillion of Mr. Turner, was hanged on Wexford bridge in 1798, for being concerned in the murder of his maſter; and at the place of execution he declared, in the preſence of the high ſheriff and three magiſtrates of the county of Wexford, who took down and atteſted his confeſſion, that he had obtained abſolution for it from father Murphy, pariſh prieſt of Kilruſh, and father Ryan, who officiated at Ferns‡. Doctor Caulfield, titular biſhop of Ferns, on the 19th of March, 1800, wrote a letter to Bryan Murphy, a prieſt, in which he accuſes him of "diabolical audacity to attempt to hear ſacramental confeſſions, and to give the

---

* See the ſtate of the counties of Wicklow, Wexford, Mayo, and Sligo, during the rebellion, in Sir Richard Muſgrave's Hiſtory thereof, in which theſe groſs perjuries are minutely deſcribed. Ibid, vol. ii, p. 455.

† It is well known to be a doctrine which is conſtantly practiſed in the Church of Rome, for the biſhop or the apoſtolic ſee to delegate a power to the inferior clergy, to give abſolution for crimes of very great enormity; a power which they reſerve to themſelves, except on extraordinary occaſions, ſuch as to perſons *guilty of murder*, or *rebellion* againſt their liege ſovereign, in obedience to a Papal bull, as occurred in the caſe of Urban VIII, which we mentioned.

‡ Sir Richard Muſgrave's Hiſtory of the Rebellion, vol. ii, p. 425.

unfortunate penitents absolution, which was not in his power to give, thereby heaping coals on his own head, *leaving the unhappy sinners in their sins,* and, as was his practice, *leading them to utter perdition;*" and the reasons which he assigns for his incompetency to do so, as stated by his bishop, is, that he had not obtained *any faculties* from him*.

It is universally admitted, by the votaries of the holy sec†, "that any doctrine inserted in the body of the canon law, becomes the doctrine of their church;" now, in the canon law we find it asserted‡, that the Pope may absolve persons from their oaths; that Pope Zachary§ deposed the King of France, not so much for his crimes, as that he was unfit to rule; that we are absolved‖ from all oaths to an excommunicated person**, and that it is our duty to yield no obedience to him. That clergymen†† ought not to swear allegiance to their prince, and that they are exempt‡‡ from the jurisdiction of the secular magistrate. And the Council of Trent§§ has confirmed all these canons, to the observance of which‖‖ all their priests and dignitaries are sworn.

What opinion must the reader have of Sir J. C. H.'s information on this subject, when he asserts in pages 23 and 61, that the form, the practice, and the supposed effects of absolution are the same in the Protestant and Romish churches, and that the latter *does not claim any power with respect to absolution, that is not claimed by the Church of England itself?* As to the nullity of oaths to an heretical state, the following incident, which occurred a short time previous to the rebellion of 1798, proves that it is maintained in Ireland. A loyal Papist, in the county of Wicklow, informed his landlord, Captain King, of Rathdrum, that it had been decided

---

* Sir Richard Musgrave's History of the Rebellion, vol. ii, p. 426.

† Father Ellis's Sermon before the King, Dec. 5th, 1806, p. 21.

‡ Gratian. Can. 15. Quæs. 6, auctor itatem, edit. 1518, 4to, et fidelitatis etiam juramento Romanus nonnullos absolvit.

§ Id. Ibid. Can. alius. ‖ Id. Ibid. Can. nos sanctorum.

** All heretics are excommunicated at Rome in the Bulla Cœnæ Domini.

†† Gratian. Can. 15, distinct. 63, fol. 90.

‡‡ Id. fol. 135, col. 3, lit. h.

§§ Decernit et præcipit sacros canones et concilia generalia omnia, necnon alias apostolicas sanctiones in favore ecclesiasticarum personarum, libertatis ecclesiasticæ et contra ejus violatores editus. Sess. 25, c. 20.

‖‖ Bulla Pii 4ti, super forma Profess. Fidei.

and declared by their clergy, that ſuch oaths were not binding. This man, therefore, recommended to Captain King to frame a particular form of a teſt oath, which the members of his corps ſhould be aſked voluntarily to ſwear, and he at the ſame time aſſured him, that numbers of thoſe who were diſaffected would refuſe to take it. His prediction turned out to be true, for forty-four Papiſts, who were United Iriſhmen, refuſed to take it, and quitted the corps. This teſt oath, and the occaſion of framing it, having been inſerted in the Dublin Journal, it was adopted by the officers of many corps in the counties of Dublin, Wicklow, and Wexford; and it produced univerſally the ſame effect*. The rebellion would have been much more deſtructive than it was, but that great numbers of Popiſh traitors were diſarmed by this fortunate diſcovery†. Butter's deſcription of an oath taken by the Iriſh traitors, previous to the rebellion, is ſo ſtriking, that we preſent it to our readers.

"We are not commanded to forbear,
"Indefinitely at all to ſwear,
"But to ſwear idly and in vain,
"Without ſelf-intereſt or gain.
"For breaking of an oath and lying,
"Is but a kind of ſelf-denying;
"A ſaint-like virtue, and from hence
"Some have broke oaths by providence,
"Some to the glory of the Lord
"Perjur'd themſelves, and brake their word‡.
"And this the conſtant rule and practice
"Of all our late Apoſtles' acts is§.
"Was not the cauſe at firſt begun
"By perjury‖, and carried on?
"Was there an oath the godly took,
"But in due time and place they broke?"

In page 33, Sir J. C. H. commends a liberal expoſition of the doctrines of the Council of Trent, by the elegant Boſſuet, Biſhop of Meaux, and he ſays that the Calviniſts pre-

* All theſe perſons had previouſly taken the oath of allegiance, and the United Iriſhman's oath.

† All this is to be found at large in Sir R. Muſgrave's Hiſt. of the Rebellion, vol. I, p. 372.

‡ The cruſade againſt heretics was to the glory of the Lord.

§ This alludes to the prieſts who perjured themſelves, and encouraged their flock to do ſo.

‖ The oaths which they took before the rebellion to lull the magiſtrates.

dicted, that it would have drawn on him the thunders of the Vatican, becauſe they aſſerted that he had betrayed his church, and that his expoſition was not the doctrine of the Church of Rome.

But Sir J. C. H. ſtates, as a proof of the pure and liberal principles of that church, that the biſhop nevertheleſs received the higheſt eulogies from every quarter, and two ſucceſſive briefs from Pope Innocent XI, in commendation of his work. We think it right to remind our readers, that Lewis XIV endeavoured to maintain the following doctrines, "that God has not given to Peter or his ſucceſſors any power, direct or indirect, over the temporals of princes, and that he cannot abſolve ſubjects from their oath of fidelity." This occaſioned a violent breach between the court of France and the holy ſee, filled at that time by *Innocent XI,* who boldly maintained the contrary, oppoſed that potent monarch, and finally ſucceeded by a full eſtabliſhment of the *diſpenſing and depoſing doctrines**.

In page 56, Sir J. C. H. ſays,

"I have ever underſtood, and I have the beſt authority† for ſaying ſo, that excommunication, as taught and practiſed by the R. C. prelates of Ireland, has no civil effects whatever, and has barely conſiſted of depriving the offending party of the ſacraments, and other ſpiritual benefits of the Church; and that no more is aſſumed by them than that which all deſcriptions of Chriſtians aſſume, namely, the power of ſevering their refractory members from their communion."

We are ſurpriſed at his groſs ignorance of hiſtory, in not knowing the woeful effects of Papal excommunications for many centuries, in producing the dethronement of ſovereign princes, and often their aſſaſſination, and the maſſacre of their ſubjects, in conſequence of treaſonable conſpiracies, civil wars and rebellions. We have ſtated various inſtances of this, from the tenth century to our own times, and we ſhall refer our readers for them to the preceding part of this Review.

During the horrid Iriſh rebellion of 1641, the confederate Catholics of Kilkenny, conſiſting of all the nobility, gentry, and dignified clergy of the Roman Catholics, arrogated and

---

* The Council of Trent confirms all the impious doctrines of the Councils of Lateran and Conſtance, and no perſon could palliate or excuſe the impious doctrines of the latter.

† He means the authority of the Iriſh titular biſhops, who have already impoſed upon him, and will deceive him as often as he appeals to them.

uſurped all the powers and functions of the parliament and the executive government, and renouncing their allegiance to an heretical ſovereign, as they were bound to do by the principles of their religion, offered the kingdom of Ireland to the Pope, the Kings of France and Spain, and to the Duke of Lorrain. After various fruitleſs endeavours to expel the King's viceroy, the Marquis of Ormond, by force of arms, by the perfidious violations of truces and treaties of peace, and other acts of treachery, they had recourſe to an expedient which anſwered their moſt ſanguine wiſhes—the denouncing an excommunication againſt him, by the Popiſh prelates and clergy. In this they declare to the people, *that they found themſelves bound in conſcience, after great deliberation, to declare againſt the continuance of his Majeſty's government in the Marquis of Ormonde, and that they are no longer to obey his orders and commands, and that they muſt ſerve againſt* THE COMMON *enemy, for the defence of the Catholic religion.* It ends thus: *And we do fulminate the annexed excommunication, of one date with this declaration, againſt all oppoſers of the ſaid declaration. Jameſtown, 12th of Auguſt*, 1650. In conſequence of this, all his adherents, and even his own relations, who were Papiſts, deſerted him; and he was obliged to retire to England.

We ſhall refer our readers to vol. 22, p. 506 of this work, for the dreadful effects of excommunication in Ireland, and for the unbounded influence which it gives the Popiſh prieſts over the multitude. This was in the caſe of Donovan, a baker, excommunicated by O'Brien, a prieſt, in the county of Cork. In page 56, where Sir J. C. H. aſſerts, "that no more is aſſumed by them (in the Romiſh Church in caſes of excommunication) than that which all deſcriptions of Chriſtians aſſume, he adds the following note,—"Vide the letters of the R. C. prelates in the appendix, in which the miſrepreſentations on this ſubject are fully refuted, particularly in the recent caſe of the prieſt O'Brien and Donovan, which produced a trial."—"Vide Appendix VI, in which the tranſaction is particularly noted by Dr. Milner." We ſhall in the firſt place obſerve, that Sir J. C. H. is not founded in his aſſertion, that what we advanced on that affair was a miſrepreſentation, and that it was refuted by Dr. Milner. On the contrary, the Doctor admits the facts, but only ſays, that the denunciation of Donovan was without the knowledge or approbation of the Popiſh biſhop, Dr. Coppinger. The following facts cannot be denied, that Donovan was completely ruined by the denunciation of prieſt O'Brien; for having been held in abhorrence even by his neareſt friends, he was

deprived of all social comfort, and, as churchmen say, was interdicted ab aqua et igni. By the verdict of twelve men he recovered 50*l*; and it is well known that he ought, and would have obtained damages to the amount of 500*l*, but that some Papists were on the jury Some weeks after, Donovan having gone to mass, the same priest, by an inflammatory philippic against him, kindled an extraordinary degree of fanatical rancour against him in his ignorant and besotted congregation Having then hallooed them at the poor baker, they assaulted and forcibly dragged him out of the chapel. For this O'Brien was indicted at the quarter sessions of the county of Cork, and was convicted, to the satisfaction of every person present. Doctor Milner, in his letter, (Appendix VI, p. 71) to Sir J. C. H., observes, "O'Brien himself, in his justification, dated last October 16th, and published in the Star, Courier, and other newspapers, adds, on this occasion, that he "had no precedent in the canons or practice of the Catholic religion for what he did." As the Romish Church has been noted for the most palpable and infamous forgeries, falsehoods, and fabrications, from the beginning of the 6th century to the present time, we cannot be surprised at the hardened audacity of priest O'Brien in making this groundless assertion. We have unequivocally proved (p. 273, et seq. vol. xxviii) that excommunication is founded in the general councils and canons of the Romish Church, and we have described its woeful effects in the case of Robert, King of France, so early as the year 996. Any person who has resided any time in Ireland, cannot but know what unbounded influence the Popish priests derive from it;—an influence which, joined to the power which they enjoy from auricular confession and absolution, has enabled them, for above two centuries, to rouse the multitude into rebellion. Dr. Milner says, in a note on the 71st page of his letter, "it was acknowledged at the trial, by Dennis Sullivan, one of Donovan's own witnesses, that the latter, if left to himself, would not have brought the action, but that he was *excited* to it, and *supported* in it." It may be said with equal truth, that of the number of Popish priests who were hanged or transported for having taken an active part in the rebellion of 1798, none would have been punished, had not the civil magistrates *excited* and *supported* the witnesses, many of whom were afraid to give evidence, dreading the effects of Popish vengeance, raised and directed against them by excommunication. About four years ago, a tradesman in the county of Sligo brought an action against a priest, for having ruined him by an excommunication; but he was nonsuited, as of many witnesses whom he had summoned to give evi-

dence, none would venture to attend, dreading that they ſhould be involved in the ſame fate. It is well known that the adminiſtration of juſtice is materially impeded in Ireland by the influence of Popiſh prieſts in deterring witneſſes from giving evidence, and that this will check the civilization of the Iriſh nation. Spenſer, Secretary to Lord Grey, in Elizabeth's reign, ſtates and laments that this, joined to the proneneſs of the Roman Catholics to commit perjury, obſtructed the execution of the laws.

Sir J C. H., in p. 9, animadverts on the following obſervation of Doctor Duigenan, and denies the truth of it: "every Britiſh ſubject who acknowledges a foreign ſupremacy, muſt be a traitor." Lord Coke declares, in his 5th Report, page 12, that it is high treaſon to acknowledge the ſupremacy of a foreign prince in any manner whatſoever; and he therein gives ſome inſtances of perſons convicted of that crime in the reign of Edward I, for having held an intercourſe with the See of Rome; and this he ſays "before any Statute or Act of Parliament was enacted in that caſe." So that it was high treaſon at common law to do ſo. He ſays, alſo, in p. 23 of the ſame, that the laws which were enacted in the reigns of Henry II, Edward I, Edward III, and Richard II, "*were made but in aſſurance of the common law.*" He ſtates alſo, that the Archbiſhop of York produced a Papal bull, and attempted to act under it, "for which his high contempt againſt the King, his crown and dignity, in refuſing to execute his Sovereign's commandment, fearing to do it againſt the Pope's proviſion, by judgement of the common law, the lands of his whole biſhoprick were ſeized into the King's hands, and loſt during his life, which judgement was before any ſtatute or act of parliament was made in that caſe*." He further ſays, "that for the like offence, the Archbiſhop of Canterbury had been in a worſe caſe, by the judgement of the ſages of the law, than to be puniſhed for a contempt, if the King had not extended grace and favour unto him†." During the time of our Saxon anceſtors, it was a high crime to acknowledge or ſubmit to the Pope's ſupremacy. About the year 679, Wilfred, Archbiſhop of York, appealed to the Pope againſt an ordinance made by a ſynod of Biſhops and Preſbyters, and produced a Papal bull againſt it. Egfrid, King of Northumberland, having ſubmitted it to the conſideration of a council conſiſting of the nobility and clergy, they rejected it with indignation, and had Wilfred impriſoned

* Ibid, p. 23.

† Theſe prelates acted only under the Pope's ſpiritual power.

for having dared to appeal to a foreign jurisdiction. That judicious historian, Carte, makes the following observation on this transaction: "Thus the liberty of the Saxon Church was vindicated on the close of the seventh century, in the kingdom of the heptarchy, consisting of no less than six counties*." By a law of Edward the Confessor, the King is declared to be supreme head of the church, and it is directly pointed at the Papal supremacy†. Those who acknowledge the general councils as a rule of faith, must profess and submit to the Pope's supremacy, both in temporals and spirituals, in the most unlimited manner, as it emanates from them, and they are the foundation on which it rests. Would any Roman Catholic dare to assert that he would recognize some parts of the general councils, and reject others? This would be considered as downright blasphemy, as all modern Romish divines insist on their infallibility; and therefore the votaries of the Holy See must acknowledge the Papal supremacy in the most unqualified manner. But suppose that they acknowledged the spiritual exercise of it only, they must still be regarded as traitors for doing so, because the dispensing with oaths, and the excommunicating and deposing sovereign princes, are held to be part of their spiritual power. But all the most eminent modern divines of the Romish Church go much farther, for they insist on the infallibility of the Pope. Doctor Troy, in page 75 of his Pastoral Letter of 1793, says, "Notwithstanding the opposite opinions of Catholics respecting the Pope's personal infallibility, when pronouncing solemnly, or, as it is termed, ex cathedra‡, on points of faith and morals, *these different condemnations*, in various ages, have been uniformly approved by the church dispersed, and represented by the majority of Bishops." The Rev. Doctor Milner goes one step farther, for he maintains the infallibility of the Pope, without the aid of the Cathedra. He says, in his "Ecclesiastical Democracy Detected," published in 1793, "The Pope has a right of addressing his

---

* Carte, vol. I, p. 250.

† Spelman's Council. tome I, p. 108.

‡ We presume that this cathedra was somewhat similar in its effects to the tripod, on which the priestess of Apollo sat when she pronounced oracles, in producing inspirations and illapses of the Holy Spirit.

"Ex adyto, tanquam chordis, responsa dedere,
Sanctius, et multo certa ratione, magis quam
Pythia, quæ tripode ex Phœbi, lauroque profatur."

LUCRETIUS.

doctrinal inſtructions, and eccleſiaſtical mandates, *to every perſon of the church*; which mandates do not derive their authority from the acceptance of ſuch portion of the church; and if theſe are not oppoſed by the church at large, *they are to be received as coming from Chriſt himſelf* *," page 98. "I was educated in the belief of the Pope's inerrancy, nor have I yet ſeen ſufficient arguments to change my opinion. No greater danger can reſult to the ſtate from admitting the inerrancy of the Pope, than from admitting that of the church itſelf; and not a hundredth part ſo much as from allowing each individual to erect a little tribunal of infallible authority in his own breaſt, for deciding on the ſenſe of Scripture †." This is that luminary of the Romiſh Church, on whoſe aſſurances for its pure and immaculate doctrines Sir J. C. H. relies with a degree of credulity bordering upon weakneſs; and it appears alſo from his correſpondence with Doctor Troy, that he has derived much light from that oracle of the Holy See. According to the opinions delivered by theſe prelates, of the infallibility of the Roman Pontiffs, all the bulls and decretal epiſtles which they ever iſſued for excommunicating and depoſing ſovereign princes, for abſolving their ſubjects from their oaths of allegiance, and for invoking them to riſe in arms againſt their rulers, were founded upon divine authority, and their right to do ſo at this time is founded on the ſame ſanction.

In page 13 Sir John C. H. ſays, it does not ſignify where this ſpiritual power is lodged.

"Whether with the Patriarch of Moſcow, or the Pope of Rome‡, provided the ſtate is ſatisfied with ſuch pledges as Catholics are called upon to give in the oaths of 1791 and 1793, in which they declare, '*that they do not believe that the Pope of Rome*, or any other *foreign Prince, Prelate, State, or Potentate, hath, or ought to have, any temporal or civil juriſdiction, power, ſuperiority, or pre-eminence, directly or indirectly, within this realm.*'"

We have already proved, that the maſs of the Iriſh Papiſts pay no regard to an oath of allegiance; and we have fully proved, that the ſpiritual power of the Pope neceſſarily involves his temporal ſupremacy.

---

* What blaſphemy! The Pope calls himſelf Vicar of Chriſt, to which Doctor Milner aſſents.

† The Rev. Doctor Milner was one of the Engliſh proteſting Catholics in 1789, on whoſe ſuppoſed liberality the Parliament repealed many of the penal laws.

‡ The people of Great Britain are much better pleaſed to have it lodged with our gracious Sovereign than the Pope.

Sir J. C. H. says (p. 12) "in fact it is confined to a supremacy purely spiritual, a supremacy which is considered inherent in all churches, as well as that of Rome." "The Kirk of Scotland maintains a supremacy (p. 14) equally independent of the temporal jurisdiction of the crown. The General Assembly considers itself paramount in its definitions of doctrines and decrees of discipline, and convenes and dissolves itself." He therefore concludes that the Papal supremacy, limited merely to spirituals, may be safely admitted in England, and that the test oath denying and excluding it may be repealed. This is a strange way of reasoning It should be considered that the synods, or ecclesiastical assemblies, who preside over the different sects of Christians, confine themselves only to their own votaries, and never interfere with the concerns of any other church; and they do not profess any of those uncharitable and unchristian-like doctrines, which have been a fruitful source of treasonable conspiracies, of assassinations, of civil wars, rebellions, and massacres. As to the Kirk of Scotland, they acknowledge the king's supremacy; and as a proof of it, they allow his Majesty's moderator to preside in their general assemblies.

A Second Letter to Samuel Whitbread, Esq. M.P. containing Observations on his Bill for the Establishment of Parochial Schools in South Britain; also Supplementary Observations on the Religious Systems maintained by the Monthly and Critical Reviewers, in their Strictures on the Author's first Letter to Mr. Whitbread. By John Bowles, Esq. 8vo, Pp. 122. 3s 6d. Stockdale, Pall-Mall; and Rivingtons. 1808.

MR. Bowles's first Letter to Mr. Whitbread was noticed by us, at the time of its publication, and we earnestly recommended it to the public, as containing a strong and excellent antidote to the deleterious qualities of Mr. Whitbread's bill, which, thanks to the wisdom and vigilance of the House of Lords, was arrested in its progress, and so prevented from disgracing the statute book of the realm. In our review of that Letter, and other tracts on the same subject, we delivered our sentiments on the plan of Mr. Whitbread so much at length as to render any repetition of them in this place wholly unnecessary. It may, however, not be improper to state, that, after the attentive and dispassionate

conſideration of the queſtion, all our original objections to that plan are ſtrengthened and confirmed; and we truſt we ſhall not live to ſee a Britiſh Houſe of Commons again give its conſent to any national ſyſtem of education, which has not for its baſis and its primary object the promulgation and extenſion of that pure religion which is profeſſed by the miniſters and members of the Eſtabliſhed Church of England and Ireland.

The Letter to Mr. Whitbread occupies but one half of the tract before us; but to that letter we ſhall now limit our attention, reſerving his comments on the Anti-chriſtian principles of certain modern critics for a different department of our work, and for a future number. Mr. Bowles begins by expreſſing a hope, that as Mr. Whitbread, when he introduced his bill, took no farther notice of Mr. Lancaſter's ſyſtem (which he had before moſt harſhly and moſt inconſiderately eulogized), upon mature conſideration, he had become "ſatisfied of its tendency to endanger the Eſtabliſhed Church, and, indeed, the intereſts of Chriſtianity in general." And this hope is ſtrengthened, by the circumſtance of Mr. W. having, in a note to a printed report of his ſpeech, rendered juſtice to Dr. Bell, as the real inventor of the new plan of education, by obſerving that, "to him the world are firſt indebted for one of the moſt uſeful diſcoveries which has ever been ſubmitted to ſociety." But, as our author very properly reminds Mr. W., "the merits of Dr. Bell, with regard to this plan, are not confined to its diſcovery. That gentleman has reduced it to practice, firſt at Madras, and ſince in this country." Our readers will remember our remarks on the peculiar merits of Dr. Bell's plan, of which religion conſtitutes the baſis and the object, in our review of that gentleman's Sermon on the Education of the Poor, preached at Lambeth, in the month of June laſt.

If there be any conſiſtency in Mr. Whitbread, if his practice correſpond with his profeſſions, he will not fail to move the Houſe of Commons to beſtow a ſuitable reward on Dr. Bell, as the author of "one of the moſt uſeful diſcoveries which has ever been ſubmitted to ſociety." Surely if the man who diſcovers, or ſupplies, a new mode of ſecuring the body from the attacks of a dreadful diſeaſe; if the inventor of a new ſyſtem of draining land; be entitled to the gratitude and favours of Parliament, *he* muſt be infinitely more deſerving them, who fortifies the mind, and ſecures the ſoul, againſt the aſſaults of infidelity, immorality, and vice, by facilitating the acquiſition of that religious knowledge to the

poor and uninformed, which at once teaches them their duty, and encourages them to perform it; and who thus renders to ſociety the moſt eſſential benefit which it is capable of receiving from man. This is the only means of making adequate reparation to Dr. Bell for the injury which he has ſuſtained by having the merit due only to him aſcribed to another; and that other ſuch a man as Mr. Joſeph Lancaſter! Lancaſter's ſyſtem is, indeed, dangerous to the Eſtabliſhed Church, and the general intereſts of Chriſtianity. It is an *Anti-chriſtian ſyſtem*, eſſentially, and neceſſarily; although the pliant uſurper has belied his original principles, it is ſaid, or rather pretended to make them bend to his intereſt, by ſubduing thoſe radical objections to the uſe of creeds, which he ſtigmatized as being calculated only for the encouragement of *a ſect-making ſpirit*, for the ſole purpoſe of depriving the oppoſers of his plan of *one* of their arguments. But it is impoſſible to allude to this ſubject, without deploring, moſt ſeriouſly, and moſt feelingly, the countenance which this moſt miſchievous and Anti-chriſtian plan ſtill continues to receive from ſome of the higheſt perſonages in this kingdom. Her Majeſty, it is ſaid, and we fear with too much truth, ſtill honours Lancaſter with her patronage and protection; and one ſchool, at leaſt, is reported to have been eſtabliſhed, by her Majeſty's directions, conveyed through the medium of Mrs. Harcourt, in the vicinity of Windſor, on Lancaſter's plan, and under his ſuperintendance. This ſchool, indeed, has been approved by the curate (and what curate would have the reſolution to withhold his approbation from an inſtitution honoured with ſuch a patroneſs?), who, it is ſaid, viſits it conſtantly; of courſe, we muſt conclude, that *creeds* are not excluded from it. But we have radical objections to the preference thus given to the uſurper Lancaſter over the legitimate founder of the ſyſtem, Dr. Bell. Lancaſter is a diſſenter from every Chriſtian church, and, indeed, nothing but the liberal courteſy of modern times could aſſign to him the denomination of a Chriſtian. His objection to Chriſtian inſtruction was clearly and fully explained in the firſt developement of his plan and its principles; his practice, too, was ſtrictly conformable to his profeſſions, for of all his monitors, who acted as his uſhers, and who were deſtined to be the maſters of theſe ſchools which he propoſed to eſtabliſh throughout the realm, and who probably act in that capacity at this moment, not one was a member of the Eſtabliſhed Church! We ſhall, therefore, contend that it is the bounden duty of every member

of the eſtabliſhment, and indeed of every member of any branch of the Chriſtian Church, to ſet his face againſt ſuch a man; and, however, by an intereſted departure from his own principles, moſt ſolemnly proclaimed, he may ſeek to remove the unanſwerable objections originally urged againſt his ſyſtem, to afford not the ſmalleſt encouragement to it, directly or indirectly. This being the caſe, then, how can the adviſers of royalty; the confidential counſellors of the illuſtrious Conſort of that firm, magnanimous, and unſhaken, DEFENDER OF THE FAITH, who is the lawful head of the Eſtabliſhed Church, who has, on every occaſion, ſo virtuouſly and ſo reſolutely ſtood forth to ſupport its rights, and to maintain its great bulwarks, equally againſt its falſe friends, and its avowed enemies; forbear to open Her Majeſty's eyes to the dangerous conſequences of lending the ſanction of her countenance to a ſyſtem, the natural tendency of which is to bring up a generation of infidels? Even, if Lancaſter and the only uſeful part of his ſyſtem were ſo inſeparably linked together, that they could not be parted, there ſhould not be a moment's heſitation in rejecting the benefits of the latter, rather than to afford encouragement to the miſchievous principles of the former. But, in the firſt place, education is not at that low ebb, in this country, which certain pſeudo-philanthropiſts and ſectaries would have it believed; and, in the next place, every advantage to be derived from Lancaſter's ſtolen plan is to be found in Dr. Bell's original ſyſtem, together with all thoſe greater benefits which this vain and officious Quaker has ſo daringly excluded from his. Dr. Bell, too, is a man of education and learning; a divine of the Church of England; of ſound principles; active, intelligent, and zealous. Admitting, then, what can only be admitted, even for a moment, for the ſake of argument, that the two plans were equally excellent, can there exiſt a doubt, in the mind of any friend to the Church, that a preference ſhould be given to the conſiſtent Proteſtant over the doubting Quaker? or that the education of the riſing generation could be entruſted with greater ſafety to the former than to the latter? At no other period ſince the reformation (the uſurpation of Cromwell only excepted) could ſuch a man as Lancaſter, with ſuch a ſyſtem of education as his, have met with the encouragement which he has experienced. But there is ſuch a laxity of principle in the preſent times, ſuch a want of zeal and diſcrimination in matters of the higheſt importance, ſuch a torpid indifference in reſpect of religious concerns, as threaten

the moſt fatal conſequences to the Church, and, conſequently, to the State. And if they who ſurround the great do not ſeek to open their eyes to this ſad, but ſerious, truth; and to lead them to adopt a line of conduct formed on a conviction of its vaſt importance; they will neglect the moſt eſſential of their duties, and draw upon themſelves a weight of reſponſibility, which they will find it more eaſy to incur than to ſupport.

Mr. Bowles indulges a ſmile at Mr. Whitbread's curious idea of promoting the cauſe of religion, morality, and virtue, *merely* by having boys taught to read, write, and caſt accounts; but the paſſage is too good not to be tranſcribed.

" In the preamble of your Bill, it ſtands confeſſed that the true object of the education, or, as you term it, the inſtruction of youth, is ' the promotion of religion, morality, and virtue.' The means by which you propoſe to purſue this object, are, inſtruction in reading, writing, and arithmetic. You muſt not be diſpleaſed, Sir, if I confeſs, that, notwithſtanding the gravity and importance of the ſubject, I find it difficult to repreſs a ſmile, when I contemplate this ſtrange aſſociation of ideas. You, Sir, have deeply conſidered the ſubject: you, doubtleſs, have traced, link by link, the chain of reaſoning which connects the widely-diſtant terms of your propoſition,---that inſtruction in reading, writing, and arithmetic, tends to promote religion and morality. But you muſt not be ſurpriſed that ſuch a propoſition, burſting at once, without any demonſtration or illuſtration, upon ſuperficial minds, ſhould produce a ludicrous effect. It is true, to the word inſtruction, the term ' right' appears in your preamble to be prefixed. But, as any ſix individuals may conſtrue this term in as many different ways, it does not caſt a very ſtrong light upon the ſubject. It is alſo true, that, in the courſe of the diſcuſſion which your Bill produced in the Houſe of Commons, you and your friends ſeemed diſpoſed to ſhew no quarter to thoſe unfortunate underſtandings that could not diſcern a truth, which I conceive every one muſt allow to be far from ſelf-evident. You contended that your ſyſtem muſt neceſſarily produce the effects which were expected to reſult from it. One member is reported to have aſſerted, unreſervedly, that ſuch inſtruction as was intended to be given by the Bill could not fail to promote morality and virtue; another, that the more inſtruction the people received, the more muſt their morals and their induſtry improve; and you yourſelf are ſaid to have argued, that, to teach them to read and write would enable them to appreciate as they ought the advantages of morality and virtue: nay, you even inferred, that in the mind of one gentleman (Mr. Windham), enlightened as you declared it to be, there muſt be ' a very dark ſpot,' ſince it did not perceive the juſtneſs of theſe concluſions. At the riſk, however, of incurring the reproach of complete intellectual darkneſs. I will venture to aſſert, not only that there does not neceſſarily exiſt any connection between the kind of

inſtruction which you propoſe to impart to the lower orders and the practice of religion and virtue, but, alſo, that much danger is to be apprehended, leſt ſuch inſtruction prove injurious, in a fatal degree, to the true intereſts of religion and virtue. The education which, according to your plan, the legiſlature was to provide for the poor, was *inſtruction in reading, writing, and arithmetic;* and in conformity with the principle which you maintained, and upon which your Bill is expreſsly founded, the deſired effect, namely, the promotion of religion and virtue, was to follow as a neceſſary conſequence. Now, reading and writing (to ſay nothing in this place of arithmetic), are in themſelves mere arts, the utility of which depends ſolely on the application. They are the appropriate means for the acquiſition and diffuſion of ſcience. But ſcience, their proper object, even in its higheſt ſtate of perfection, may be, and frequently is, unaccompanied with any regard for religion and virtue. The above arts are not, however, excluſively applied to the acquiſition and diffuſion of ſcience: they are ſometimes converted into engines of the moſt extenſive and laſting miſchief. They are not unfrequently employed in diſturbing the order of civil ſociety, in promoting anarchy and confuſion, infidelity and vice. They are the ordinary methods of corrupting the principles and inflaming the paſſions of the riſing generation. They are found to be moſt potent inſtruments to excite the lower orders to tumult and inſurrection, by making them diſſatisfied with the inferiority of their own lot, envious of that of their ſuperiors, and impatient under the ſalutary reſtraints of law. That they are capable, by being applied to ſuch baſe purpoſes, of endangering the happieſt conſtitution that it has ever been the lot of humanity to experience, no one, who remembers the effects which were produced by the productions of Thomas Paine, can doubt."

Mr. Bowles, however, takes ſpecial care to guard himſelf againſt the imputation of arguing againſt the uſe of a thing from its poſſible abuſe. And his ideas as to the general inſtruction of the poor are ſtrictly conformable with our own; namely, that they ſhould receive ſo much inſtruction as ſhould enable them to read the ſcriptures, and, with proper aſſiſtance, to underſtand them. Indeed this is neceſſary, or at leaſt deſirable, for every Chriſtian; becauſe the Divine Founder of their faith has commanded them to ſearch the ſcriptures for the divine truths which he came to unfold and to confirm.

"It is truly aſtoniſhing that enlightened minds ſhould fall into errors which are at once ſo palpable and ſo dangerous, eſpecially when a plain, a ſafe, and a direct path lay immediately before them. If, as you ſeem to be fully aware, the true object of education be to promote religion and morality, what can be ſo obvious as that, in order to effectuate this its deſign, a *religious education* ſhould be beſtowed? By ſuch an education, if properly conducted, youth

would be taught their duties to God and man. They would thus be guarded against the snares to which they must otherwise be exposed, in consequence even of the moderate degree of literary instruction of which they are susceptible. In thus neglecting to provide the means which are exclusively calculated to promote the end which you professedly had in view, you are shut out from all excuse, since those means were repeatedly pointed out to you: notice, and pressed upon your consideration. One member (the Chancellor of the Exchequer) expressed his firm conviction, that, by a *religious education* alone the people could be made good subjects, and their happiness be established: and another member (Mr. Pole Carew) moved, that the word *religious* should be inserted in the preamble of your Bill, before the word *instruction*. To this proposal you objected, on the ground that the word instruction, as applied to children, *implied*, in common acceptation, religious and moral instruction. This is an undoubted truth; but it is a truth of which you, Sir, are not entitled to avail yourself. On the contrary, it places the defectiveness of your system in a still more conspicuous view. That the word instruction, as applied to children, generally implies religious and moral instruction, is owing to the care which has been taken by those who have provided the means of education, that religious and moral instruction should be imparted. In your Bill, no such care appears to be taken, and therefore you are not entitled to the benefit of the implication, of which you endeavour to take advantage. Private education is to be considered as under the more immediate superintendance of parents; but those well-disposed persons who have founded public eleemosynary institutions, for the purpose of education, have considered religious instruction as a matter of too much importance to be left to chance, or to the discretion of those to whom the conduct of education might happen to be entrusted. They have therefore provided for such instruction as a primary object, and have guarded, by fundamental regulations, against the possibility of its being neglected. Shall the State, Sir, be the only patron that makes no provision for the religious instruction of those whom it educates? Shall the State —the order, quiet, and safety of which depend so much upon the prevalence of religious principles, and the consequent practice of religious duties—neglect the precautions which every private benefactor thinks it necessary to take, in order to insure the great object of education,---religious and moral instruction?

" If, indeed, there were no established religion in the country, it would be attended with considerable difficulty to incorporate religion with a system of national education; because, in that case, no one religious system could, for such a purpose, claim a preference over the rest. It was, apparently, a sense of this difficulty which led Mr. Joseph Lancaster, when he forgot the preference which, with a view to national education, was justly due to the Established Church, to propose that generalizing system of religious instruction which, in order to include in its support ' all denominations of professing Chris-

tians,' was to inculcate no religious opinions about which thoſe denominations had differed, but only thoſe in which they all agreed: a ſyſtem which would obviouſly exclude inſtruction in any of the eſſentials of Chriſtianity, and, conſequently, in Chriſtianity itſelf. Happily, however, no ſuch difficulty exiſts among us. We have an eſtabliſhed religion, which is founded on the revealed will of God, and which moſt ſtudiouſly inculcates every Chriſtian duty; a religion, of which it may truly be ſaid, that there is no virtue which its members are not thereby inſtructed to practiſe; no vice which they are not thereby ſpecifically admoniſhed to avoid. How natural was it, when the legiſlature was deviſing a plan for the education of the children of the lower claſſes,——a plan, the avowed object of which was to promote religion and morality; how natural, I ſay, was it to make the inculcation of ſuch a religion the diſtinguiſhing feature, or rather the operative principle, of the meaſure! Nay, how aſtoniſhing is it, that the Commons of Great Britain, in parliament aſſembled, in paſſing a Bill for the above expreſs purpoſe, ſhould have overlooked a proviſion ſo admirably and ſo obviouſly calculated for the attainment of the end which they had profeſſedly in view!"

This omiſſion is, indeed, aſtoniſhing; but it is another dread ſymptom of the *liberality*,---in other words---the *indifference*. of the age. Mr. Bowles purſues this train of reflection, and offers many pertinent and forcible remarks upon the ſubject. The diſtinction which he draws between *education* and *inſtruction*, which Mr. Whitbread ſtrangely confounds, is equally ingenious and juſt. Adverting to Mr. Whitbread's panegyric on the good effects reſulting from the education of the poor in Scotland, Mr. Bowles reminds him, that, in that country, none but members of the eſtabliſhed religion can, by law, be entruſted with the care of educating children; and he, very naturally, aſks him how he came not to have recourſe to the ſame means of producing ſimilar effects in England, where our anceſtors were, at leaſt, as provident as the Scotch on this head.

"In England, until very lately, the laws relating to education were ſubſtantially the ſame as thoſe of Scotland. It was, indeed, a principle of the old Engliſh law, that the keeping of ſchools was a matter of eccleſiaſtical juriſdiction*; and a very wiſe principle it was. For as ſound religion, good morals, and competent learning, muſt be conſidered as indiſpenſable qualifications in thoſe who undertake the inſtruction of youth, ſo no other claſs in the whole community can be ſuppoſed equally fit to judge of thoſe qualifications as

---

"* In Cox's caſe, Lord Keeper Wright ſaid, 'I always was, and ſtill am, of opinion, that the keeping of ſchools is, by the old laws of England, of eccleſiaſtical cognizance.'—1 P. Williams, 32."

the clergy. The principle itself is derived from the ancient canons, which, though destitute of any intrinsic authority in this country, yet, having been immemorially adopted, have thereby become a part of the common law: and which received, moreover, the express sanction of the legislature in the reign of Henry VIII, when it was enacted that *all canons, constitutions, ordinances, and synods-provincial, being then already made, and not repugnant to the law of the land, or the King's prerogative, should still be used and executed*; in which statute they are denominated 'customed and ancient laws of the realm, originally established as laws of the same, by sufferance, consent, and custom, and none otherwise.*'

"In the exercise of this common law, ecclesiastical jurisdiction over schools, it was a fundamental regulation that every schoolmaster should have a licence from the bishop of the diocese. The reasonableness of this regulation is most apparent, for it is to be presumed that, in order to obtain the bishop's licence, the party applying for it must pass such an examination as is best calculated to ascertain whether he is properly qualified for the instruction of youth. Even after obtaining a licence, every schoolmaster was required, at the bishop's first visitation after his admission, to exhibit his licence, to be, by the said bishop, either allowed, or, upon just cause, disallowed and rejected†. The necessity of the bishop's licence, to authorize the keeping of a school, was fully recognized in Cox's case‡, and also in that of Rushworth‖; in reference to the last of which it was observed by Lord Kenyon, in the case of the King against the Archbishop of York¶, that *the Court thought that the Bishop had done right in suspending the licence until he had inquired into the moral character of the party applying for it.* But that necessity does not rest solely on the authority of the common law and of adjudged cases; it has been at different times confirmed by the legislature, which has subjected to various penalties every person acting as a schoolmaster or teacher without being thereunto licensed by the bishop; and which has, moreover, like the law of Scotland, required of every such person conformity to the established worship. By the 23d Eliz. c. 1, s. 6, every person keeping a schoolmaster, who does not '*repair to Church*,' or is not '*allowed by the bishop or the ordinary of the diocese*,' forfeits 'for every month so keeping him, ten pounds;' and the schoolmaster or teacher '*presuming to teach contrary to this Act*,' is, upon conviction, '*disabled to be a teacher of youth*,' and liable to '*suffer imprisonment without bail or mainprize for one year.*' By the 2d Jac. I, c. 4, s. 9, every schoolmaster (except in certain specified cases), unless he be '*specially licensed thereunto by the archbishop, bishop, or guardian of the spiritualities of the diocese*,' and also the party retaining or maintaining him, '*forfeits each of them, for every day so wittingly offending, forty shillings.*' And by the 13th and 14th

---

"* 25 *Hen.* VIII, c. 19. † *Can.* 137. ‡ Ante, p. 50. ‖ 2 Strange, 1023. ¶ Durnford and East's Reports, 490."

Car. II, c. 4, f. 8 and 11, '*Every ſchoolmaſter keeping any public or private ſchool, and every perſon inſtructing or teaching any youth in any houſe or private family, as a tutor or ſchoolmaſter,*' *is required to ſubſcribe a declaration or acknowledgment of conformity* '*to the Liturgy of the Church of England;*' *and every* '*ſchoolmaſter or other perſon inſtructing or teaching youth in any private houſe or family, before licence obtained from his reſpective archbiſhop, biſhop, or ordinary of the dioceſe,* ACCORDING TO THE LAWS AND STATUTES OF THIS REALM, *and before ſuch ſubſcription and acknowledgment made as aforeſaid.*' *is liable to* '*ſuffer three months impriſonment, without bail or mainprize.*'— Finally, at ſo late a period as the year 1795, the Court of King's Bench, in the caſe of the King againſt the Archbiſhop of York, fully recognized the biſhop's right of licenſing ſchoolmaſters, as the ancient and ſtill exiſting law of the land. In that caſe, the Court was applied to for a *Mandamus* to the Archbiſhop of York, to licenſe a perſon who had been appointed to teach a grammar-ſchool at Skipton, in the county and dioceſe of York, and the Archbiſhop, in his return, alleged that he had refuſed to grant the licence, becauſe the perſon applying for it would not ſubmit to be examined, touching his fitneſs and ſufficiency in learning. The Court unanimouſly decided that the return was good; and Lord Kenyon, after deducing from the common and ſtatute law, and the authority of precedents, 'the power of the ordinary to licenſe ſchoolmaſters,' concluded the opinion pronounced by him in the following terms: 'I cannot forbear ſaying that I think that if the Archbiſhop had examined into the moral character and religious tenets of this gentleman, as well as his learning, he would not have exceeded his duty; perhaps, indeed, the Archbiſhop was ſatisfied reſpecting the former, and only doubted with regard to the latter. In Ruſhworth's caſe, this Court thought that the Biſhop had done right in ſuſpending his licence, until he had inquired into the moral character of the perſon applying for it. I remember an application made to this Court, ſome years ago, by a perſon who wiſhed to be admitted a member of the Surgeons' Company; it was anſwered that he was not qualified, becauſe he had not a competent knowledge of the Latin tongue, which is required by a bye-law of that company; and Lord Mansfield ſaid that ſuch a bye-law was good, as it only affected perſons engaged in a liberal profeſſion. Therefore, on the ancient eccleſiaſtical law, adopted in this country in early times, and *now forming a part of the law of the land,* on the ſtatute law on the authority of the two adjudged caſes, not contradicted by any other deciſion, on the analogous caſes of eccleſiaſtical perſons preſented to the ordinary for inſtitution, and on the expedience of the thing, I am clearly of opinion that this return ought to be allowed.'

"Such is the provident care, taken by the law of England, to prevent the important taſk of inſtructing youth from falling into improper hands. At the period of the Revolution, when the principles of toleration were ſo well underſtood, and ſo liberally acted upon, the Legiſlature did not abate its vigilance in that reſpect; but, in framing

the Toleration Act, left the law relating to education precisely as it stood before. The liberality of more modern times has relaxed that law in favour of dissenters. But great caution should be observed in meddling with long-established systems, since political experience is perpetually demonstrating that effects may otherwise be produced, widely different from those which are intended; and the result, however in a limited view it may seem to be profitable to *a few*, is frequently found to be ultimately injurious to *all*. This has been the case in the present instance. By a statute, made in the present reign *, it is enacted that *no Protestant, dissenting from the Church, who at the quarter-sessions shall take the oath of allegiance and supremacy, and subscribe the declaration against Popery, which is required of dissenting preachers and teachers by the Toleration Act, and also a declaration of belief that the Scriptures do contain the revealed will of God, 'shall be prosecuted in any court whatsoever, for teaching and instructing youth as a tutor and schoolmaster, any law or statute to the contrary notwithstanding.'* And by a subsequent statute †, the like indemnity is extended to such dissenters as are Romanists, provided *at the quarter-sessions they take and subscribe the oath and declaration of allegiance and abjuration specified in that Act.* It cannot be doubted that the object of the Legislature, in passing these statutes, was to consult the feelings of dissenters, by enabling them, *legally*, to employ teachers of their own religious persuasion in the education of their children. But for that purpose nothing more was necessary than to release teachers so circumstanced from the obligation of conformity to the established worship; and there was no necessity whatever to dispense, in their favour, with the fundamental regulation, which required all schoolmasters to obtain the Bishop's licence.—Had the Bishop been required, for such a purpose, to grant his licence to persons of that description, provided he found them in other respects properly qualified, no pretence for complaint could possibly have remained; and it would have been a real benefit to dissenters themselves, if the instructors of their children had still been obliged to obtain such a testimonial, as to their moral character and their literary qualifications.—In dispensing with that obligation, the Legislature may have consulted their feelings, but it has injured their true interests; while, by abandoning its superintending care of education, it has opened the door for much mischief to the community at large. It has not only exposed dissenters of all descriptions to the artifices of every unqualified pretender, who presumptuously undertakes the arduous work of education, but it has also contributed to bring into general disuse, and almost into total oblivion, the salutary laws which were precisely intended to prevent that work from falling into such hands, and which it never designed to invalidate. The consequence is truly lamentable: every person who is so disposed, is allowed to become an instructor of youth, without any inquiry into either his literary or his moral qualifications: without any other ceremony than the mere exhibi-

"* 19th *Geo.* III, c. 44, s. 2." "† 31st *Geo.* III, c. 32, s. 13."

tion of a board, on the outside of a houſe, pompouſly ſtyled *a ſeminary;* in ſhort, without any more preparation, and, perhaps, with a much inferior capital in abilities for the undertaking, than are thought neceſſary to qualify for a commercial ſpeculation of the moſt ordinary kind. Indeed this profeſſion, though intimately connected with the future happineſs of the riſing generation, is often the laſt reſort of perſons, whoſe ignorance or want of character has fruſtrated every other hope of ſucceſs in life."

We earneſtly recommend theſe judicious remarks to the ſerious attention of his Majeſty's miniſters. They relate to a ſubject of the greateſt importance. The increaſe of Diſſenters of every denomination, and particularly of Methodiſts, who ſupply a crowd both of *preachers* and of *teachers* deſtitute of every qualification for thoſe ſacred offices, furniſhes the moſt ſubſtantial ground of alarm to the friends of the eſtabliſhment. Some ſtop muſt be put to their licentiouſneſs. If we ſuffer this growing evil to ſpread, we ſhall prove ourſelves utterly unworthy of that pure religious ſyſtem which our anceſtors ſo ſtrenuouſly laboured to tranſmit to their poſterity entire, and free from all corruption. *Toleration* ſhould be extended to *Chriſtians* of every denomination, but nothing beyond that can be reaſonably expected, or ſafely conceded.

As this tract is written with the greateſt moderation and temper, we hope Mr. Whitbread will peruſe it with attention, and profit by the information which it contains and the ſuggeſtions which it conveys. The "Supplementary Obſervations" will be duly noticed in our next.

The Oriental Voyager; or deſcriptive Sketches and curſory Remarks on a Voyage to India and China, in His Majeſty's Ship Caroline, performed in the Years 1803, 4-5-6. *Interſperſed with Extracts from the beſt Modern Voyages and Travels. The Whole intended to exhibit a topographical and pictureſque Sketch of all the principal Places which are annually or occaſionally viſited by our Eaſt India and China Fleets. The Routes to and from India, illuſtrated by the Tracks of His Majeſty's Ships Caroline and Meduſa, correctly ſet off on a Chart, extending from the Britiſh Iſles to Canton.* By J. Johnſon, Eſq. Surgeon in the Royal Navy. Pp. 418, 8vo. 10s 6d. Aſperne. 1807.

AN obſerving, intelligent, and lively traveller, who ſees, feels, and deſcribes with conſiderable facility, acuteneſs, and accuracy. Mr. Johnſon has learning enough to raiſe him above the

vulgar level, knowledge ſufficient to give dignity to his remarks, and taſte to embelliſh them ſatisfactorily to the public. He uſhers his Oriental Voyager into the world with a dedication to the Right Hon. Lord Viſcount Melville, which, as we are well aſſured, is unqueſtionably *true*, we ſhall in part tranſcribe. "I am unacquainted with your Lordſhip, except through the medium of your public character; and I have taken the liberty of dedicating the following ſketches to your Lordſhip, not from gratitude for paſt, or the ſmalleſt hope of future favours, to myſelf individually, but becauſe you have always been the LIBERAL FRIEND OF THE NAVY, and particularly of that department to which I have the honour of belonging. In embracing this opportunity of publicly expreſſing my high ſenſe of gratitude for the *eminent ſervices* which you have rendered every claſs of naval ſociety, I am conſcious that I merely recite the general voice of that important body: and if the following pages ſhould be found to merit the peruſal, or in any degree contribute to the amuſement of your Lordſhip, during ſome hour of relaxation from affairs of ſtate, I ſhall deſire no other recompence than the pleaſure of reflecting that I have diſcharged a part of that obligation to your Lordſhip, which is ſenſibly *felt* and *gratefully* acknowledged by *all* ranks in His Majeſty's naval ſervice."

This frank manly addreſs does great honour to its author, who thus declares the truth freely and candidly, in favour of the naval adminiſtration of Lord Melville. It will be ſome time before we hear of the *gratitude* not only of the ſurgeons but of "all ranks in His Majeſty's naval ſervice," to Lord St. Vincent. This, however, is not Mr. Johnſon's only example of a regard to truth, in what relates to the good of ſociety: "he has taken ſeveral opportunities of introducing faithful pictures drawn from life, and, alas! from death alſo; pictures which, perhaps, too faintly exhibit thoſe ruinous conſequences that reſult from intemperance, and other ſpecies of immorality in tropical climates particularly: perſuaded that example is the moſt effectual method of impreſſing the minds of young men with a juſt abhorrence of ſuch deſtructive practices. He has likewiſe introduced various obſervations and remarks on the local diſeaſes of the country, and of the means of preſerving health in hot climates, circumſtances which he flatters himſelf will procure this little work a favourable reception with every one embarking for our eaſtern poſſeſſions." In this expectation we are perſuaded that he will not be diſappointed.

Mr. Johnſon begins his voyage from Cork to Madeira, in May 1803, and gives a brief deſcription of this well-known iſland, now under Britiſh protection. Thence he proceeds to the Cape of Good Hope, taking on his rout, by way of digreſſion, a deſcription of the Brazils from Barrow's travels, in which occur ſome very abſurd and improper obſervations on polygamy in warm climates. As the author did not ſtop at the Cape, he again has recourſe to the accounts given by Mr. Barrow and Mr. Tuckey of that ſettlement, the one in 1797, and the other in 1803. On the 4th of September they diſcovered the mountains of Ceylon, where they had not arrived before Linois, apprized of the war, had made his eſcape from Pondicherry roads, "Buonaparte having diſpatched veſſels with intelligence of the war, long before its actual commencement, to the different foreign ſettlements." This is an additional proof, if any were wanting, of his hoſtile determination. The author's account of the landing at Madras is lively and facetious, and for a more general deſcription he has recourſe to an extract from Hodges. From Madras the author proceeded to Calcutta, and ſtopping to take in freſh proviſions at Kedgeree, a ſmall village on the weſtern bank of the Hoogly, below Calcutta, "three or four pine-apples coſt only an ana or two-pence, fowls and ducks two rupees or five ſhillings per dozen, geeſe three rupees or ſeven ſhillings and ſix-pence per dozen, and all other ſpecies of ſtock equally reaſonable." The following deſcription of the alligator, which is ſo formidable an animal on the banks of the Ganges, is curious, and contains ſome original obſervations on the organization of this deſtructive animal.

"I purchaſed a young alligator," ſays the author, "about four feet in length (many are from twenty-eight to thirty feet long), from a fiſherman who caught it in his net. Its figure exceedingly reſembles the guana, and it likewiſe bears a conſiderable ſimilitude to the lizard; it could run but ſlowly along the decks, with its lower jaw cloſe to them, and on preſenting a ſtick, it would ſnap at and lay hold of it very readily. The extent to which it would open its mouth on theſe occaſions, could not poſſibly be effected by the falling of the lower jaw alone, which it kept nearly in contact with the decks: the two jaws, therefore, in this operation ſeemed to recede from each other like the blades of a pair of ſciſſors when opening. As I conceived that this appearance might poſſibly give riſe to the old opinion, that the upper jaw of the crocodile was moveable, I examined particularly the head of this one after its death. In the firſt place, there was no joint or motion between the upper jaw and the head, as the Jeſuits at Siam, who diſſected this animal, have juſtly remarked; but they have not (if I recollect right) taken notice of

any peculiarity in the lower jaw's articulation with the bones of the head, which is different from that of any other animal with which I am acquainted. Here, inſtead of the *head of the under jaw bone being received* into a cavity in the bones of the ſkull (as I believe is generally the caſe), it was, on the contrary, *hollowed out*, to receive an articulatory proceſs from the ſkull, as if the former was meant to be the fixed point, and the latter the moveable one. The fact is, that when the animal is opening his mouth to any great extent, while the lower jaw falls, the ſtrong muſcles on the back of the neck *draw backwards the head, and raiſe the upper jaw at the ſame time:* this, in all probability, firſt ſuggeſted the idea of the mobility of the crocodile's upper jaw. Here, as uſual, nature has artfully adapted the ſtructure to the peculiar functions of the animal. The alligator, whoſe legs are very ſhort, and whoſe jaws are uncommonly long (perhaps one-eighth of his whole length), could not, when on ſhore, be able to open his mouth to half its natural extent, if the motion depended on the under jaw alone: for owing to the lowneſs of the animal's body and head, this jaw would come in contact with the ground before the mouth was ſufficiently extended; and therefore nature has given it the power of raiſing the upper jaw occaſionally with great eaſe.

"It is an erroneous opinion that this animal's back bone is not ſufficiently flexible to allow his turning ſhort, when in purſuit of his prey, and that therefore a man, by taking a winding courſe, when purſued, might eaſily elude him. I would not adviſe any one to truſt to this manœuvre; though I believe the alligator ſeldom attempts to ſeize any creature otherwiſe than by ſurprize: for this purpoſe he frequently lies among the mud or the ſhores of this river, or the creeeks that open into it, and when any animal is paſſing near him, he is almoſt ſure of ſecuring him, on account of the great length of his deſtructive jaws. He frequently too throws himſelf acroſs the boats that are hauled up into theſe creeks, and tears the poor defenceleſs fiſherman to pieces in an inſtant, or dives to the bottom of the river with him, where he devours him at his leiſure. Dogs, eſpecially of the Paria kind, and jackals, that come down to the edge of the river to drink, very often fall ſacrifices to the inſidious alligator, who will lie cloſe to the banks, and at thoſe times very much reſembles the trunk of a tree, or pieces of floating wreck. It is ſaid, that when in purſuit, (which however is ſeldom the caſe) he generally endeavours to get abreaſt of the object, and then, by making a ſweep with his extenſive jaws, he ſeldom fails to ſecure his victim. The teeth of this animal are terrible to behold: long, ſharp, and interlocking with each other, evincing his being ſolely carnivorous; beſides which, there are two in the front of the lower jaw, longer than the reſt, and which pierce through the upper jaw, coming out at two apertures near the noſtrils: ſo that having once laid hold of its prey, there is little chance of its being able to extricate itſelf afterwards from ſuch engines of deſtruction."

The Delta of the Ganges formed by the eight mouths of that river is above two hundred miles broad, and is covered

with wood, interfected with numerous navigable ſtreams, amidſt the moſt romantic ſcenery, of the tract called the *Sunderbunds*, which are inhabited by almoſt every kind of the moſt deſtructive and ferocious animals. At the iſland of Saugur, the tigers are ſo fierce that they will ſwim to the boats near the ſhore, and deſtroy the men in them during the night. Next to the danger of theſe wild and fierce beaſts, muſt be ranked another, more fatal although leſs horrible, the intemperance of Engliſhmen in the climate of Hindoſtan. The author's remarks on this ſubject are ſtriking and judicious; he contends that in ſuch a hot climate vegetable food ſhould be the chief repaſt, and inſtead of roaſt beef and wine, fiſh and boiled rice, like the Hindoos, ſhould be uſed by all thoſe who wiſh to avoid liver complaints and bilious fevers. Continence is a virtue not leſs neceſſary to health and even to the preſervation of life in India. Yet half informed men talk of polygamy in warm climates. Several facts are here related which ſtrongly evince the fatality of following the votaries of Venus. Mr. Johnſon alſo gives an accurate deſcription of the Black-hole in which Mr. Holwell and one hundred and forty-five others were immured in 1756. The origin of the name "Melancholy Point," given to a neck of land near Saugur roads, with the ruins of an old fort, is highly ſentimental. A lady and her child arrived from England at the fort on the very hour that her huſband's corpſe was carrying to the grave, in conſequence of which ſhe mourned over her child ſix weeks on this Point, and died: hence it owes its preſent denomination. This melancholy ſtory is followed by the obſervation of a fact not leſs ſhocking.

"Nothing can be more diſguſting," obſerves Mr. J. "to the eye of an European, than the number of floating corſes that are daily ſeen paſſing and repaſſing with the tides on the Ganges; eſpecially between Fulta and Calcutta, where they are not ſo liable to be devoured by ſharks and alligators. The ſpeckled hue which they exhibit, renders them ſtill more odious to the ſight; for by the time they have arrived at that ſtate of putrefaction which cauſes them to float, a great part of the ſcarf ſkin, and mucous net (colouring ſubſtance of Indians,) has peeled off, and expoſed the true ſkin beneath, which being as white as an European's, gives them a very motley and loathſome appearance."

The next object of our entertaining author's attention is Pulo Penang, or Prince of Wales's Iſland, ſituated at the entrance of the ſtraits of Malacca, about two or three miles from the Malay peninſula, oppoſite to the northern point of Sumatra. Here the author is original in his deſcriptions, and his firſt excurſion was to ſee a waterfall about five miles up the

country, through a moſt delicious atmoſphere filled with the odour of the moſt fragrant trees, ſhrubs, and flowers. The caſcade is on the brow of a hill, where the cryſtal water falls above one hundred feet, interrupted twice by thin ſhelving rocks which precipitate it into other rocky beds, forming a ſeries of inferior caſcades. Although Mr. J. defers his general deſcription of this iſland till his ſecond viſit, we ſhall here unite them.

" Prince of Wales's Iſland, called by the natives Pulo Penang, from a Malay word, ſignifying Areca-nut and Betel, lies on the fifth parallel of north latitude, and George-town in 100° 20′ 15″ of eaſt longitude. It is nearly an oblong ſquare, about ſixteen miles long, and from ſix to eight broad, diſtant between two and three miles from the Malay ſhore. It was given to Captain Light by the King of Queda, and firſt ſettled in 1786. The greater part of the iſland is occupied by a lofty irregular ridge of mountain, (running in the direction of the iſland north and ſouth) the modern extremity of which is by far the higheſt; and here they have a ſignal-houſe and ſeveral bungalows erected. The whole of this ridge is covered with a foreſt of trees of immenſe ſize; and between its eaſtern baſe and the ſea, facing the coaſt of Queda, there is a level ſlip of land, from two to four miles in breadth, and ten or twelve long. This is well cultivated, and laid out in gardens, plantations of pepper, betel, areca, cocoa-nut trees, &c. interſected in all directions with pleaſant carriage roads, the ſides of which are lined with a variety of ſhrubs and trees that are in perpetual verdure. Through the whole of this ſpace are interſperſed a number of villas and bungalows, where the Europeans occaſionally retire to enjoy the country air, as a relaxation after buſineſs in town. On the north-eaſtern point of this plain are ſituated Fort-Cornwallis and George-town, the latter called by the natives Tanjong Painaique. The population of this iſland may be of European ſettlers and their dependants, Malays, Sumatrans, Chineſe, &c. fourteen thouſand, itinerants two thouſand, in all ſixteen thouſand; although this is perhaps rather under-rated. From the oppoſite ſhore are conſtantly brought over great quantities of all kinds of proviſions and fruits, which are ſold here at a very reaſonable rate. Abundance and great variety of excellent fiſh are caught in every direction round this iſland, which from the ſalubrity of its air, is juſtly eſteemed the Montpellier of India. *Coups de ſoleil* are ſeldom experienced in this ſettlement, although the Europeans walk and ride about at all times of the day, completely expoſed to a vertical ſun. In ſhort, as ſoon as the wet docks are eſtabliſhed on Pulo Jaraja (a ſmall iſland between Penang and the main), this will be the moſt beautiful, healthy, and flouriſhing ſettlement in the Eaſt Indies. From the dawn of day, until the ſun has emerged above the high mountains of Queda, and even for ſome time after this period, Penang rivals any thing that has been fabled of the Elyſian Fields. The dews which have fallen in the courſe of the night, and, by remaining on the trees, ſhrubs, and

flowers, have become impregnated with their odours, early in the morning begin to exhale, and fill the air with the moſt delightful perfumes; while the European inhabitants, taking advantage of this pleaſant ſeaſon for air and exerciſe, crowd the roads in carriages, on horſeback, and on foot, till the ſun, getting to ſome height above the mountains of Queda, becomes ſo powerful as to drive them into their bungalows, to enjoy a good breakfaſt with a keen appetite.

"The low lands of Penang being liable to inundation in the rainy ſeaſon, the houſes of the Europeans are all elevated from the ground eight or ten feet on arches or pillars. They ſeldom conſiſt of more than one floor, are built of wood, and thatched over with leaves of trees, &c. the roofs reſembling thoſe of cottages in England, having the eaves projecting over the verendas in order to throw off the rain into the areas. They are all detached from each other, and ſurrounded with gardens, and trees of various kinds, that defend them in a great degree from the ſun. The town itſelf, which is inhabited by people of almoſt every country, from the Red-Sea to China, is about a quarter of a mile long; the ſtreets are pretty regular, though the houſes are very far from being ſo; the Chineſe, Malays, and Hindoos, following their own taſte in the conſtruction of them. There is a good fiſh-market, while rice, poultry, and vegetables, are cheap and plenty in every ſtreet. The Chineſe are here, as at Malacca, the moſt induſtrious claſs; and as they meet with liberal encouragement, they will, no doubt, contribute greatly to the improvement of this infant ſettlement."

Mr. J. continues his deſcription of the rural ſcenery of this enchanting iſland with all the enthuſiaſm of the poet, dwelling on all its diverſified beauties in hill, dale, valley, and rivulet, covered or ſhaded with the moſt luxuriant vegetable products of nature. To theſe are added beautiful villas, bungalows, pepper plantations, gardens, groves of the cocoa-nut, betel, areca, and various other fruits, interſperſed here and there with Hindoo temples or pagodas, Chineſe joſs-houſes, Chriſtian chapels, and various places of worſhip, with the towns of Fort-Cornwallis and George-town. The fineſt view, which the author enjoyed, was from the principal mountain, which is three miles of a "ſteep and rugged" aſcent, not however impaſſable by the "little Sumatran horſes, which mount it with great ſafety," although ladies are carried up in a kind of ſedan-chair, amidſt a moſt ſalubrious atmoſphere, intoxicating by its odoriferous perfumes and the fragrance of its gentle breezes. This delightful iſland being about 100 degrees eaſt of England, it is ſun-ſet in the former, and mid-day in the latter, nearly at the ſame time. The ſcenery and atmoſphere, agreeably to Addiſon's idea, have had a powerful effect on our author, as they have inſpired him with a poetic vein to produce twenty-one ſtanzas, "written at the Convaleſcent

Bungalow, March 1805," which are by no means deſtitute of poetical merit, and are ſtill more reſpectable as containing ſome good moral and medical didactic verſes. There are no ferocious animals in this new paradiſe, and the birds have the moſt beautiful plumage, but, with the exception of one which far ſurpaſſes any thing the author ever before heard, they are deſtitute of thoſe "melodious wood-notes wild" which charm us in other leſs gaudy birds. The domeſtic animals are not numerous: horſes are brought from Pedir on the coaſt of Sumatra, buffaloes from Queda, and ſheep, &c. from Bengal. Alligators are common on the ſhores, which render it unſafe to bathe: large ſnakes have become rare, but bandicotes, a ſpecies of large rats, are numerous and deſtructive, as are alſo the white ants, which conſume the interior of beams and rafters, and leave a thin external ſhell of ſound wood that deceives the eye, and lulls the unſuſpecting lodger into a fatal ſecurity. When theſe dangerous inſects find their way into ſhips, it becomes a ſerious concern; and, as they cannot be diſcovered, there is on other remedy than ſinking the veſſel in ſhallow water for ſome days, till they are drowned. The thermometer there generally ranges from 70 to 80 degrees, and ſometimes at night ſo low as 62; and ſo cool did it feel, that the author generally ſlept under a blanket—"a very rare occurrence within 6 degrees of the equator." A very ſingular inſect of this iſland, about an inch long, called the trumpeter, has a voice as loud as that inſtrument.

We have already extended our account of this amuſing volume beyond our uſual limits, otherwiſe we ſhould have preſented our readers with ſeveral very curious particulars of the manners and cuſtoms of the Chineſe, as well as the author's profeſſional obſervations on the climate and means of preſerving health in thoſe eaſtern countries, many of which are highly intereſting. It is extremely pleaſing to know, that ſuch is the confidence of the Chineſe in Engliſh honeſty, that the Company's boxes of dollars paſs freely uncounted in Canton, and that the reſpectable manner in which the Company ſupports the eſtabliſhments of its ſervants has inſpired the Chineſe nation with reſpect for every thing Engliſh. This fact ſhould teach the narrow-minded Directors the means of civiliziug and rendering loyal the people of the eaſtern nations. Mr. J. alſo enters his proteſt againſt the miſtaken practice of keeping ſeamen too long in India, and proves that, after three or four years, their conſtitution becomes very feeble, and that they fall on the firſt attack of diſeaſe, which is, generally, the liver complaint attended by dyſentery, for which mercury

(even to ſalivation) is the only remedy. The author has alſo availed himſelf of the beſt deſcriptions of the different parts and curioſities of our ſettlements in India, which he has himſelf viſited, in addition to his own remarks, and thus formed a very agreeable, and we apprehend accurate, perſpective view of thoſe countries. Upon the whole, we have never had the pleaſure of reading a more agreeable nor a more uſeful volume to perſons deſigning to undertake an Eaſt India voyage, nor one which more happily blends entertainment with important information. The author has given it in its original and ſimple form of a journal, which will not fail to amuſe and inſtruct moſt readers, while it will gratify the curioſity of all.

Bath Characters; or Sketches from Life. By Peter Paul Pallet. 8vo. Pp. 80. 5s. Wilkie and Robinſon. 1807.

IN his *Proœmium*, as he calls it, or prefatory addreſs to the reader, Mr. Pallet profeſſes to have diſcovered "that in attacking folly and vice, *ridicule* is oftentimes a more uſeful inſtrument than grave reprehenſion.

"Ridiculum acri
Fortius et melius plerumque ſecat res."

We wonder that his reſearches did not lead him farther to diſcover that the gratification of ſpleen, or of malice, was no legitimate end of ſatire; that perſonal attacks, by a man who does not chuſe to avow himſelf, are neither fair nor manly; and that the ancient ſatiriſts eſtabliſhed a very different maxim, which a writer whoſe *real* object is to cry down folly and vice will not fail to adopt—Dicere de vitiis, parcere perſonis; a maxim which Mr. Pallet, ſo far from receiving it as his guide, has completely reverſed.

He does not deprecate, he tells us, *candid* criticiſm; but "againſt *one* ſet of cenſors *we*" (Peter Pallet and *Co.*, we ſuppoſe) "beg leave to put in our eternal proteſt---the wretched hirelings of the A—i J——n Review; who have neither *ſagacity* to detect blemiſhes; *taſte* to diſcover beauties; nor *liberality* to beſtow the fair meed of praiſe on any writer whoſe principles are not in uniſon with their own mean, *confined*, and deſpicable opinions." To the charge of being *hirelings*, we ſhall only ſay, *mentiris*, Pallet. On the nature and extent of our *ſagacity* and *taſte*, our readers muſt be left to decide. To *liberality* we prefer no claim; thinking, as we do, that a ſingle line of *plain truth* is worth a folio volume of it. If we

do not beſtow "the *fair* meed of praiſe," we are ſomething worſe than *illiberal;* we are *unjuſt*. But to ſuch a charge we plead *not guilty:* we dare the author to ſupport it by proof; and, in the mean time, we cannot be expected to give any other anſwer to a bold aſſertion, than an unqualified contradiction. In reſpect of our *opinions*, it became Mr. Pallet to explain to his readers to *which* of them he meant to apply the epithets *mean*, *confined*, and *deſpicable*. We are not diſpoſed to fight with ſhadows: but, if he will deſcend to particulars, we will diſcuſs with him the juſtice and propriety of his charge. Meanwhile we will not withhold from him the gratification which he will, no doubt, derive from the acknowledgment, that we ſhall probably admit our opinions to be *confined*. We are not very fond of *latitudinarianiſm*, either in doctrines, in faith, in principles, or in opinions. Our religious doctrines are *confined* to the Scriptures; our faith is *confined* to the Articles of the *Eſtabliſhed* Church of England, which are built on the Scriptures; our moral principles are *confined* to the ſame ſource, for *ſcriptural morality* is the only morality we admit; and our political principles and opinions are *confined* to the Conſtitution of Great Britain, as ſettled, confirmed, and expounded by the exiſting laws of the land. We are very well aware, that theſe *confined notions* are conſidered as *mean* and *deſpicable* by the numerous herd of ſectaries and infidels, of every claſs and denomination, who are now ſpreading, like locuſts, over the country, unſettling the minds of men, by the diffuſion of their fanciful and pernicious tenets, and opening the way for anarchy and deſtruction. But neither the hatred of theſe men, nor the impotent falſehoods of ſuch a ſatiriſt as Mr. Pallet, ſhall ever deter us from giving a firm, manly, conſiſtent, and *independent* ſupport to the eccleſiaſtical and civil conſtitution of the realm, and from diſplaying a determined oppoſition to their enemies, whether foreign or domeſtic.

We can have no ſtronger proof of the depraved taſte of the public than the multitude of *perſonal ſatires* which have lately iſſued from the preſs, and the reception which they have experienced. *Folly* is certainly a fair ſubject for ridicule, and *vice* calls for ſevere reproof. And ſome of theſe ſatires (though very few) have had not only for their *avowed*, but for their *radical*, object, the expoſure of the former and the correction of the latter. But ſtill there has been a licentiouſneſs in perſonal attacks, in reſpect of individuals and of the ſelected objects, exceeding all the bounds of legitimate ſatire. The "Bath Characters" are exhibited in five dialogues, three of which are evidently written for no other purpoſe than to

bring the clergy of the Eſtabliſhed Church into contempt:—but more of this preſently.

The *firſt* is a dialogue between the Maſter of the Ceremonies, under the name of *Ramrod*, and a faſhionable babbler, *Tom Rattle*; and it is conducted with great humour and ſpirit on both ſides. We ſhall exhibit, as a ſpecimen of the author's ſtyle and manner, the following delineation of ſome legal characters (well known, we ſuppoſe, at *Bath*, though certainly not to us), which is ably drawn.

"But, pr'ythee, dear Jack, ſtep a little on one ſide, or you'll be involved in the atmoſphere of *Scotch ſnuff* that always floats around the ſerene, benign, and ſweet-featured countenance of Counſellor *Moroſe*, whom I juſt ſee coming in. My laſt converſation with him, though a ſhort one, had well nigh occaſioned my death, from the convulſive ſternutation which was produced by the curſed impalpable powder that he throws up his noſtrils by ſpoonfuls. 'My dear friend,' ſaid I, 'I am happy to ſee you.'—'Fair and ſoftly, Mr. Prattle,' replied he: 'I have been man and boy now for ſeventy years, and yet I never met with any one who, in my judgment, had a right to addreſs me by *that title*.'—And I firmly believe he ſpoke the truth; for, from infancy to age, he has been like a porcupine with a quill pointed in every direction, and ready to be diſcharged againſt any one who approached him. His father begot him in a thunderſtorm, and his mother produced him during a hurricane. His firſt articulate words were an execration; and, at the age of nine months, he deprived his old nurſe, by a blow, of her only remaining front tooth. He choſe the law as a profeſſion, becauſe it promiſed him the pleaſure of *eternal oppoſition*; and, after half a century of ſquabbling, left the bar, becauſe he diſcovered that he was become *ridiculous* inſtead of continuing to be only *irritating*. He is ſuch an admirer of primitive ſimplicity in *ſpeech* and *appearance*, that he was never yet known to ſay a *civil* thing to any one, nor to be ſeen *clean*, even by accident, during the whole courſe of his life; and he is ſo earneſt for the character of veracity, as never to advance the moſt ſimple propoſition without confirming it on *oath*."

This is good dramatic writing, and there is much of the ſame kind in other parts of the pamphlet. But even in this dialogue the author cannot refrain from libelling the clergy. Ex. gr.: "All hail! thou honour to the prieſthood; ſin in canonicals; and lechery at eighty-ſix!

"Servetur ad imum
Qualis ab incepto proceſſerat.

"Who could ſuppoſe that 'this lean and ſlippered pantaloon,

'With hoſe a world too wide
For his ſhrunk ſhank, and his big manly voice
Tun'd once again to childiſh babble,'

" ſhould ſtill be a votary of the *Venus publice*, and as deep in promiſcuous intrigue as any rakehill of twenty-five?——Oh! for the cauldron of *Medea*, to plump up his flaccid cheeks; to ſwell his withered muſcles; and give his *Nonogenarian* an excuſe for gallantry, and powers for ſin."

We ſuſpect this to be a creature of the author's imagination, and a vile imagination it muſt be that could conceive it!—The *ſecond* is a dialogue between *Dr. Vegetable*, and *John Snorum, his clerk*. The doctor is repreſented as the *faſhionable proprietor* of a *faſhionable chapel* at Bath; and is made as ſelfiſh, and as filly, as any votary of faſhion, clerical or lay, need to be. If there be any *truth* in the repreſentation, the object of the ſatire may be legitimate, though the *tendency* of it would have deterred any genuine friend of religion from the adoption of this mode of inflicting cenſure, however deſerved that cenſure might be, particularly as another and more efficacious means of remedying the evil which he would be thought to deplore muſt naturally have preſented itſelf to his mind. Of theſe *faſhionable* chapels we entertain, perhaps, much the ſame opinion as Mr. Pallet; we have ever regarded *them* as *excreſcences* on the eſtabliſhment, and *faſhionable preachers* as a diſgrace to the profeſſion. Where there are not ſufficient accommodations for the pariſhioners, let other churches, or regular chapels of eaſe, be built; but let no church or chapel be even tolerated which has not proper places provided in it for the poor. At Bath, however, there may be one excuſe for the erection of irregular chapels which does not exiſt elſewhere, from the number of periodical viſitants; but theſe ought to be duly conſecrated and the officiating prieſts duly licenſed by the biſhop; and no one to be appointed without the expreſs approbation of the miniſter of the pariſh. A departure from this wiſe rule, which is perfectly conformable with the church diſcipline of the primitive ages, in a recent inſtance by the legiſlature, has eſtabliſhed a moſt dangerous precedent. Indeed, we are ſorry to ſay, that religious matters ſeem to be very little underſtood, and ſtill leſs attended to, by the majority of our members.

The *third* is a dialogue between a Bath phyſician and a Bath apothecary. The doctor, from his ignorance of Latin, makes an egregious blunder in preſcribing a doſe of laudanum for a female patient, by writing *eighty* inſtead of *eighteen* drops, by which the lady was thrown into a ſlumber, from which it was feared ſhe never would have awakened. " I found," ſays the phyſician to the apothecary, " that inſtead

of *eighteen* drops, the quantity preſcribed, you had put into the phial, at leaſt, *half an ounce of laudanum.*"—"Eighteen drops, doctor!-----why, d—mn it, your preſcription ordered *eighty*. Oh, here it is----Guttæ octoginta."——"Well, Sir; and what's the Engliſh for *octoginta? Eighteen*, is it not?" The production of the dictionary terminates the diſpute, and brings on an amicable conference, in which the utter inutility of a knowledge of the dead languages for ſecuring ſucceſs as a phyſician is fully diſplayed by argument and by example. This dialogue is written with great ſpirit and *point*, and the following humorous anecdote, which we are led to believe is original, is well worth the trouble of tranſcribing.

"A *London connection* is half the battle for a medical knight-errant. It is the good will and intereſt of ſome famous town practitioner, who, when he thinks it neceſſary to amuſe his patients by a little change of place and ſyſtem, orders them to Bath, and recommends them to Dr. So-and-ſo, as the moſt able phyſician *out of London;* and to Mr. What-d'ye-call-'im, as the beſt poſſible ſubſtitute for their own *confidential apothecary*. We accordingly take them in hand; levy our tribute upon them; and then *paſs them on* to our friends at the different Watering-places. Some caution, however, is neceſſary in carrying on our operations, leſt *a rat ſhould be ſmelt*, and the *gudgeon eſcape;* as was the caſe with Dr. Fleecem here. Sir Timothy Humbug, a practitioner of note in London, had recommended to this gentleman, in the way of trade, an old female patient of his, with a chronic complaint upon her, which had netted to Sir Timothy an annuity of 150*l* for ſeveral years. Willing to give *a turn to her thoughts*, as ſhe began to wonder that ſhe did not mend under his hands, he adviſed her to try the Bath waters, and gave her a letter of introduction to his friend Dr. Fleecem. The doctor read the epiſtle, and put it in his pocket; felt the patient's pulſe; aſked the proper queſtions; in ſhort, proceeded *ſecond-hum artem*, as we ſay: took his *fee*, and then his *leave*. But, unfortunately, in pulling out his handkerchief at the door, the letter fell upon the floor unperceived by the doctor, which the old lady, after he was gone, and with the natural curioſity of one of Eve's daughters, eagerly peruſed. It was couched in theſe words:

'*Dear Doctor,*

'*I ſend you herewith an old fat gooſe, whom I have long been in the habit of plucking: one wing I reſerve for myſelf, the other is at the ſervice of my friends.*

Your's truly,

TIM. HUMBUG.'

"On the following morning Fleecem, with all proper profeſſional attention, called upon his patient, and was going mechanically to apply his finger to her pulſe, when ſhe thanked him for his kind intention to ſtrip her of her *remaining feathers;* but obſerved, that,

though she might possibly be an *old goose*, she was not so far advanced in her *dotage* as to suffer such *harpies* as Sir Timothy and himself to *prey* longer on her *unfortunate carcass*."

The *fourth* dialogue is between "*Parson Bow low* and *Mr. Resin*." Here we are introduced to a clergyman who *swears, gets drunk*, and *talks obscenity!!!* Human nature is fallible, and frail; and, therefore, it is *possible* that, among many thousands of clergymen, there *may be* such an individual as is here represented! But let this satirist point out, if he can, any other description of men, equally numerous, so many of whom lead lives so exempt from sin, as the clergy of the Established Church. He knows that he cannot do it; and therefore, if he have any sense of shame, he will blush for his own conduct in thus holding up *exceptions* to a rule as objections against the rule itself. We must be allowed, however, to require some better authority than the ipse dixit of this anonymous calumniator, before we believe in the existence of such a clerical character as that which he has exhibited to public view. But even this exhibition does not satisfy his malice against the clergy, for he makes this imaginary parson thus apologize for his own profligacy.

"Talk of my liberties, indeed!—what are they to the rigs and pranks of the other *gemmen* of the *Cloth?* Why, there's Mr. *Chip*, who lives in a neighbouring village, a brother fiddle, as well as brother parson: he beats me hollow in *tricks* and *gallantries*. *Two strings* to his *bow*, my boy; *two mistresses* in his house at the same time—*children* by *both;* and his *wife* turned out of doors; and yet, Resin, he is still permitted to *instruct* his parishioners by his *exhortations*, and *improve* them by his *example*."

Now, if the author of this pamphlet really knows any clergyman who is so abandoned a profligate as to conduct himself in this infamous manner, and has not communicated his knowledge to the bishop of the diocese, he has been guilty of a gross breach of his duty to society. Such a man ought to have his gown stripped over his ears; to be subjected to the censures of the Spiritual Court; and to be holden up to the execration of the world. But this effect can only be produced by a regular application to the bishop, who would, of course, put the matter in a fair train of legal inquiry. If the facts were proved, exemplary punishment would certainly ensue; and the informer would be entitled to the thanks of the community. But no credit whatever is due to a man who proclaims such facts to the world, where the only purpose they can answer is to render the clergy contemptible, and to injure the cause of religion itself; whereas, by communicating them

to the proper judge, he would ſecure the object for which he *profeſſes* to write----the expoſure and the *puniſhment* of vice.

In the *fifth* and laſt dialogue the dramatis perſonæ are, *Mr. Drawcanſir* and *Dr. Skipper*. Who and what the laſt character is intended for we do not profeſs to underſtand; but it is impoſſible not to perceive that the perſon deſignated under the inappropriate appellation of *Mr. Drawcanſir*, is one of the moſt learned and moſt ſound divines of the Eſtabliſhed Church, Mr. ARCHDEACON DAUBENY, the author of *the Guide to the Church*, and of various other theological writings, which reflect equal honour on his knowledge, his talents, and his principles; a gentleman, the firmneſs and conſiſtency of whoſe character have made him many enemies, but whoſe life is as exemplary as his doctrine is orthodox. It would betray the greateſt imbecility in us to enter into a ſtudied defence of thoſe writings, which have been formerly reviewed in this work, with a degree of care and attention ſuited to their importance, againſt the wretched attacks of this miſerable ſatiriſt, who condemns them in the lump, and who, in ſpeaking of them, utters as many falſehoods as aſſertions. He thus concludes his virulent philippic. "A pretty joke, indeed! to confine the character of the only *ſound* church to *the worm-eaten fabric of the eſtabliſhment*, and ſhut the doors of Heaven againſt all thoſe who have not a *Biſhop* as maſter of the ceremonies there." Here peeps forth the cloven foot, not only in the rhapſody againſt the Eſtabliſhed Church, but in the lying imputation againſt Mr. Daubeny, who has, in no part of his writings, preſumed to do what this impudent aſſailant here aſcribes to him. The author then, in the character of Dr. Skipper, goes over the liſt of his own qualifications for theological controverſy, which conſiſt in his peruſal of all the works of the fathers, of later divines, of the reformers, and others, the liſt of which he probably obtained from Bayle, or ſome other compiler. The ſtale joke about *orthodoxy* and *heterodoxy* is repeated; "the one is *my own doxy*, and the latter is *another man's doxy*." Whatever merit the repeater of ſtale jokes is entitled to, is certainly the author's due.

But, in the licentiouſneſs of his mind, the author rambles far beyond the precincts of decency and of truth. What can be ſo contemptible as the poſitive declaration, "I am determined to ſpeak out, let the conſequence be what it may," by a man who does not even avow his name, and who deals almoſt wholly in dark inſinuations, and equivocal alluſions? Mr. Pallet concludes his laſt dialogue by obſerving, that Mr. Daubeny will not thruſt himſelf unneceſſarily into the Court

of King's Bench. "You'll remember what has been the *Meed* of certain perſons in ſimilar caſes. Depend upon it, the plan of *ſecretly* circulating abuſe will be much more ſafe for *you* than the verdict of a *ſpecial jury*. Beſides, his Lordſhip of the *Fens* will here lend you his aſſiſtance, and ſo far befriend you, that, if he cannot prove your caſe, he'll at leaſt take half the odium of defeat from your ſhoulders!"

This bold advocate of truth who "will *ſpeak out*," here *alludes* to a tranſaction which occurred in the family of Mr. Daubeny, and which made a great noiſe at Bath and elſewhere. We had heard of it before, but not till very lately; and this impudent inſinuation induced us to do what every *real* friend to *truth* ever will do, ſearch the ſubject to the bottom, and form a deliberate and impartial judgment, after hearing and weighing in an even ſcale the arguments and facts adduced by either party. For this purpoſe we obtained, with ſome difficulty, an octavo volume, of *three hundred and fifty-five pages*, every line of which we read with the greateſt attention. This volume is entitled, "*A Reply to a Paper circulated under the Name of the Biſhop of Lincoln; the Object of which is to counteract* (the effects of) *a Verdict, in an Action brought by Thomas Meade, Eſquire, againſt the Rev Charles Daubeny, before Lord Kenyon, and a Special Jury, in the Court of King's Bench, in June*, 1792 By Thomas Meade." It is *printed* and *publiſhed* (*legally* ſpeaking,) but not ſold; although addreſſed to the public, who are ſpecifically called upon to decide between Mr. Daubeny and his opponents. Though, on this account, we do not feel ourſelves at liberty to *review* it, we feel it an act of duty to obey the *call*. But before we do this, we have a word or two to ſay on a point which relates to ourſelves; and the reference to which by Mr. Meade renders it rather ſurpriſing that he ſhould not have felt it neceſſary to communicate his book to us. At the cloſe of a letter from Mr. Meade to the Biſhop of Lincoln, dated March 12th, 1806, is the following paſſage:

"Your Lordſhip thought proper to write a letter, reflecting on me, to my adverſary, who, *from his known connection with thoſe who manage or are concerned in a periodical work for the review of literary publications, muſt be preſumed to have taken advantage of his ſituation to introduce into it your Lordſhip's panegyric on himſelf and inſult on me; unconnected as your letter was with the ſubject in that Review, and inconſiſtent as the publiſhing of private manuſcript letters is with the ſcheme of ſuch works.* Whether this was manly and honourable others will judge. How far it accorded with your Lordſhip's intentions you beſt can tell, who about that time aſſured me, that you gave no authority to any one for publiſhing your opinions."

The letter here adverted to we found to have been inſerted in the Appendix to the twenty-firſt volume of the ANTI-JACOBIN REVIEW, publiſhed on the 1ſt of October, 1805. Juſtice to the Biſhop of Lincoln, juſtice to Mr. Daubeny, and, above all, a regard to truth, led us to enquire of the gentleman who conducted this work at that time, by what means a letter ſo *unconnected*, as Mr. Meade truly ſtates it, *with the ſubject in that Review*, came to be inſerted. And we have his authority to declare, in the moſt ſolemn manner, without the ſmalleſt equivocation or reſerve, that he did not receive the copy of that letter, either directly or indirectly, from the Biſhop of Lincoln or from Mr. Daubeny; that he never had the ſmalleſt communication with either of thoſe gentlemen on the ſubject of the difference between the latter and Mr. Meade; that he did not even know that there was ſuch a being in exiſtence as Mr. Meade, until he ſaw his name mentioned in that letter, which he received through miſtake, as he ſuppoſes, from a gentleman who ſent him the Bath papers, and which he inſerted only on the miſtaken ſuppoſition that it related to the controverſy about the diſtribution of the collection at the Free Church, a ſuppoſition which he continued to entertain till very recently, when he was applied to to know how it came into his poſſeſſion. He has farther authorized us to aſſert moſt unequivocally, that Mr. Daubeny had no *connection whatever* with thoſe *who either managed or were concerned in the Review;* and we add for ourſelves, that he is not at preſent, and never has been, connected with thoſe who now manage or are concerned in the Review, or who have managed or been concerned in it, ſince it paſſed into the hands in which it is now veſted. Having thus undeceived Mr. Meade himſelf, and thoſe who may have been deceived by his reflections on the ſubject of the letter, we are induced to re-inſert the letter itſelf, that our readers may judge whether it be poſſible to conſider it as *an inſult* on Mr. Meade; and whether it contains any thing which could induce the conductor of this work (who knew nothing of the tranſaction to which it relates) to ſuppoſe that it referred to any other tranſaction than that which was the ſubject of the letter by which it was accompanied.

"*Deanery, St. Paul's, May 13th*, 1805.

"Rev. Sir,

"I AM ſorry that my engagements in town have not allowed me to ſend you the incloſed papers ſooner. I beg to aſſure you that it has afforded me the greateſt ſatisfaction to find in the examination of the papers furniſhed by yourſelf and Mr. Meade, that the con-

duct of a perſon, who has diſtinguiſhed himſelf as a theological writer, and as an able advocate and zealous miniſter of our Eſtabliſhed Church, is not only free from all imputation of blame, but entitled to much commendation. I am very confident that the ſame Chriſtian moderation which you have diſplayed throughout this unfortunate affair, will induce you to accede to a reconciliation upon any terms which may be conſiſtent with your own honour and character.

"I am, Reverend Sir, &c.

"G. LINCOLN.

"*To the Reverend Archdeacon Daubeny.*"

In anſwer to Mr. Meade's *call*, who appeals, in his reply, "to the juſtice of mankind," we take this opportunity of aſſuring him, that we have read with attention every paper which his volume contains. We began with the Biſhop of Lincoln's opinion of the tranſaction between Mr. M. and Mr. Daubeny, and then peruſed Mr. Meade's reply; and, after duly weighing, with all the impartiality of which we are capable, the circumſtances, facts, and arguments, on either ſide, it is the deliberate conviction of our minds, that Mr. Daubeny is a moſt injured man; that the verdict of the jury (referred to by the author of the pamphlet before us) was a moſt *extraordinary* verdict, unwarrantable in itſelf, (as founded on the evidence of the moſt intereſted of all witneſſes), and highly pernicious in its conſequences, as tending to deſtroy all ſocial and family confidence, and even to deprive unprotected females of the neceſſary advice of their neareſt relatives; and that the Biſhop of Lincoln's concluſions from the documents laid before him (as far as theſe can be collected from Mr. Meade's own account), on all the leading and important points of the caſe, are moſt juſt and incontrovertible. Mr. Daubeny, therefore, need not heſitate to appear either in the Court of King's Bench, or in any other court; and it is, indeed, to be lamented that he ſuffered the delicacy of his feelings for his wife's family to prevail over the ſenſe of juſtice to himſelf, by leading him to reject the advice of his counſel, to move for a new trial, the iſſue of which, with the evidence which he would have been able to adduce (as it appears from Mr. M.'s reply, p. 305), could not have failed to be favourable to his wiſhes, and honourable to his character.

We have been led into this apparent digreſſion by the unfeeling impudence of this anonymous ſatiriſt; and by *other ſymptoms of hoſtility, which we have lately witneſſed*, to one, whom we think an ornament to his profeſſion, and an honour to the Church; and whom, for the ſake of that

Church, we moſt earneſtly wiſh to ſee raiſed to the Epiſcopal Bench. As to the ſatiriſt himſelf, we leave him to his own reflections; reminding him, that, qui *alterum* incuſat probri *ſe-ipſemet* intueri oportet; recommending him before he quotes *French* again to conſult his grammar; and adviſing him (more for *our own ſake*, we admit, than for *his*) to forego the more lucrative than honourable trick of ſwelling out an eighteen-penny or two ſhilling pamphlet, by the aid of a large type, to a *five ſhilling volume*.

We *ſuſpect*, as well from what *appears* in this book as from what is *omitted*; from the author's *forbearance* as well as from his *attacks*; the quarter whence it proceeds. Were our ſuſpicions converted into certainty, we would convince him that we too could wield the laſh of ſatire with, at leaſt, as much force, and certainly with more juſtice, than himſelf.

POETRY.

Another Word or Two; or, Architectural Hints continued, in Lines to thoſe Royal Academicians who are Painters; addreſſed to them on the Re-election of Benjamin Weſt, Eſquire, to the Preſident's Chair, 10th December, 1806. By Fabricia Nunnez, Spinſter. *With Dedication, Preface, Notes, and Appendix.* Small 8vo. Pp. 78. Payne. 1807.

IF we were pleaſed with Fabricia's former effuſion of good-natured ſatire, directed againſt the *architectural* Preſident of the Royal Academy of *Painters*, we have much more reaſon to be ſo with the preſent; as it evinces the ſame patriotic anxiety for the welfare of the arts, the ſame correctneſs of taſte, and the ſame genuine liberality of ſentiment, and urbanity of temper, in enlarged proportions. Nor is this all; for the muſe of Fabricia, ever chaſte and delicate, touches the lyre with more refined ſkill than formerly: her numbers flow with ſuperior ſweetneſs; and, altogether, ſhe appears "a more accompliſhed fair."

We underſtand that "this little work, which was written on the ſpur of the occaſion, at the moment of Mr. Weſt's re-election to the chair, would have been immediately ſent to the preſs, had not Fabricia's engagements, during the courſe of the ſpring, prevented her from attending to ſo *delicate a ſubject* with becoming care." However, it has made its appearance, as ſhe obſerves, "*better late than never.*"

Fabricia, after giving ſome very good advice to the Royal Academicians, reſpecting their future conduct; and after exulting in the advantages which the inſtitution will probably derive from the return of Mr. Weſt to the chair, exclaims:—

" But ſtill theſe halcyon days muſt fly;
Fabricia knows it, with a ſigh;
She knows that Weſt muſt yield his breath
To Time, in partnerſhip with Death.
Then, at that dark and awful hour,
When Death ſhall come in all his pow'r,
And Time arrive, with ſtilly ſound,
To place his relics in the ground;
When friend to friend ſhall mourn and weep,
And wail his loſs with anguiſh deep;
Should there be found, amid the art,
One who maintains a manly part,
Of lib'ral mind, from envy free,
Who feels no ſpark of jealouſy,
Poſſeſs'd of judgment, fancy, ſenſe,
And a rich vein of eloquence,
To ev'ry charm of art allied,
And ev'ry grace of wit applied;
Whoſe conſtant word, and act ſincere,
Flow from the heart—a fountain clear;
Whoſe pen and pencil, head and hand,
Rank him a fav'rite in the land;
Whom ſiſter muſes ſhall approve,
And ſtamp his worth with ſeal of love:
Should there be ſuch to claim your praiſe,
Place round his brow the envied bays;
The laurel to great merit due,
And lift him high——who raiſes you."

Our fair author evinces, in more inſtances than one, a ſtrong partiality for Mr. Shee, that " truant from the pencil to the lyre." Whether the above lines are intended as particularly alluſive to him, we know not; but we certainly know of none to whom they can with ſo much propriety be applied.

Fabricia's aptneſs of quotation will be found generally pleaſing; and, like her former work, the preſent contains not a ſingle ſentiment or expreſſion which ought to offend any one. " Her merits," ſhe ſays, " if ſhe poſſeſs any, are her own;—ſo are her faults: and this ſhe ſays, not from preſumption, but to do away a ſuggeſtion, which ſhe knows was hinted among a few artiſts reſpecting her former production. Some aſſiſtance, indeed, ſhe has received, and that from the hands of her printer, who has been aſſiduous in ſuperintending the preſs, and attentive to the punctuation;—to grace her dreſs, and render her appearance before the public more becoming." This little piece is, indeed, a ſpecimen of as neat and correct printing as we have long ſeen.

Turf-Houſe; a Poem, founded on the Succeſs of Wm. Pearce, a poor Man, who reclaimed twelve Acres of Swamp [in Cornwall] to Cultivation and Fertility, for which he received the Silver Medal and

fifteen Guineas from the Society for the Encouragement of the Arts, &c. With an Appendix containing the Particulars of the intereſting Fact. Pp. 40. 8vo. Bagſter. 1807.

WM. Pearce, of Turf-houſe, in the pariſh of Landewednack, near Helſton, in Cornwall, a day-labourer earning only a ſhilling a-day, and ſupporting a family of ſeven children, when he was fifty years of age began, after his daily labour was finiſhed, to drain and cultivate "twelve acres of ſwampy land, which after eighteen years labour produced in 1803 ten Corniſh buſhels of barley, nine truſſes of hay, two hogſheads of oats, and ten buſhels of wheat, beſides paſture for cattle." All this he effected himſelf with only an old mare to aſſiſt him in carrying coals and manure from a conſiderable diſtance. He alſo built his own dwelling houſe and out-buildings, covered and finiſhed them himſelf, although he was only bred to huſbandry, and having a natural infirmity in one of his hands. This ſingular effort of perſevering induſtry has inſpired ſome benevolent and patriotic muſe with above five hundred lines of very reſpectable blank verſe; and we hope the beneficent muſe that dictated them will alſo take the means of giving them that publicity which the poetry as well as the ſubject eminently deſerves. There cannot be a ſubject in the annals of human conduct better deſerving to be celebrated by the muſes than the preſent, as the example is important to ſociety.

EDUCATION.

Academic Letters; conſiſting of Epiſtles from Youths at School to their Friends and Parents; interſperſed with Exerciſes, Eſſays, and Pieces of Poetry; intended to aſſiſt in forming their Epiſtolary Style, and to point out thoſe Subjects which they may be capable of treating with Advantage to themſelves. By Thomas Noble. 12mo. Pp. 184. Harris. 1808.

WE have very conſiderable doubts whether the art of letter writing can be acquired by the peruſal of epiſtles avowedly written for the purpoſe of imparting a knowledge of it to youth. And we have ſtill ſtronger doubts on the practicability of inſtructing them, by ſuch examples, to write fluently and ably on any particular ſubject. We rather incline to think that a good epiſtolary ſtyle is only to be acquired by a familiar acquaintance with the works of the beſt Engliſh writers, and by habit. If, however, the acquiſition of the knowledge in queſtion be ſo to be gained (a point which we ſhall not take upon us to decide,) the Letters before us are very well calculated for the purpoſe. Some of them, indeed, ſeem rather above the capacities of boys; while the ſubject of them is not ſuch as is likely to attract their attention. The following grammatical inaccuracy occurs in p. 7. "A drawing ſhould have exactly *thoſe* ſtages of diſtinctneſs while we are ex-

ecuting it, *as* [which] are obſervable," &c. A boy, capable of writing ſuch a letter on the ſubject of landſcape drawing as that whence this paſſage is extracted, ſhould certainly underſtand grammar too well to commit ſuch a blunder as this: if he did not, his time muſt have been woefully miſapplied.

The Godmother's Tales. By the Author of Short Stories, Summer Rambles, Cup of Sweets, &c. &c. 12mo. Pp. 180. 3s. Harris. 1808.

THESE plain and ſimple ſtories cannot fail to intereſt and to improve the youthful mind. The incidents are natural; the moral is good; and the ſtyle is eaſy, perſpicuous, and correct.

The Lion's Maſquerade; a Sequel to the Peacock at Home. Written by a Lady. Illuſtrated with elegant engravings. 24mo. Pp. 16. 1s. Harris. 1807.

THE king of beaſts has here found a poet worthy to record his royal amuſements. Theſe are no puerile ſtrains; and, though not above the capacity of children, for whoſe uſe they are deſigned, they exhibit ſuch *humour* and *point* as will render them amuſing to readers of riper years and maturer underſtanding. We ſhall extract the lion's parting admonitions to his four-footed gueſts, as a ſpecimen of the poetry.

"And now their *Great Monarch*, who quitted his ſeat,
With an air of true majeſty, ſaid, 'I entreat,
'As he fears my diſpleaſure, that every *creature*
'Will to night lay aſide all that's bad in his nature.
'You have heard with what harmony *birds* can retire,
'And their conduct, in this reſpect, all muſt admire.
'In the *feather'd race* here an example we find,
'Far better than that which is ſet by *mankind*.
'How oft have their galas a tragical end!
'One loſes a miſtreſs, another a friend—
'The wife of a third has elop'd from a ball,
'A fourth the next day in a duel muſt fall:
'Yes! ſuch are the fatal effects of exceſs,
'Which *reaſon* was given to *man* to repreſs.
'But now let us tell them with pride, in their *feaſts*,
'To copy the *inſects*, the *birds*, and the *beaſts*.'
The effect of his ſpeech was immediately ſeen,
They all roar'd '*Rule Britannia*' in praiſe of his Queen.
And, as ſoon as their Monarch had quitted the room,
Without growl, grunt, or grumble, they all ſcrambled home."

"The Peacock at Home," to which this profeſſes to be a ſequel, we have not yet ſeen. The engravings to this little book are very neatly executed.

MISCELLANEOUS.

Remarks upon a Bill (as amended by the Committee) "For Promoting and Encouraging Induſtry," &c. By one of his Majeſty's Juſtices of the Peace for the County of Lincoln. *The third edition, with further additions, particularly concerning Schools.* 12mo. Pp. 44. 1s 6d. Rivingtons. 1807.

THE firſt edition of this excellent little tract was noticed by us in our 27th vol. p. 428. We are truly happy to find, that the extent of its circulation has borne ſome proportion to its merits. The additional paſſages contain ſome important obſervations. Adverting to the miſchievous works which diſaffected men would probably put into the hands of ſchool-maſters, under the new ſyſtem, the author remarks, that Mr. W. Belſham's "firſt and favourite object, in his remarks on *Mr. Pitt's Poor Bill*, was, to caſt the blame of the diſtreſſes of the poor upon *the nature of our government.*" And he then adds:

"A ſermon at St. Anne's, Dublin, by Mr. Magee, May 5, 1796, (highly approved by, and printed at the requeſt of, the Lord Lieutenant, the Primate, the Archbiſhop of Dublin, and a moſt reſpectable aſſociation) has the following note:—'It is a fact, unhappily 'too notorious in this country to need any additional teſtimony, 'that ſhort and popular Atheiſtical tracts have for ſome time back 'been circulated through every part of the kingdom, but eſpecially 'the north, with a degree of ſyſtem and zeal which have ſcarcely 'ever been exceeded; and that they have not only been ſent abroad 'at prices ſo reduced as to make them acceſſible to all, but have 'been diſtributed amongſt the peaſants, and *literally ſcattered along* '*the highways*, by perſons ſpecially employed to travel through the 'country for this very purpoſe.'"

This is a French revolutionary practice, deviſed by thoſe patriotic ſages, Briſſot, Robeſpierre, and Buonaparte's worthy maſter, whoſe miſtreſs he married, the director Barras; the object of which was to eradicate every religious and moral principle from the minds of the people, in order to render them fit inſtruments for the purpoſes of rebellion and regicides. It was, to adopt their own jargon, *pour demoraliſer, et decatholiciſer le peuple.*

The additional remarks on the fifth article of Mr. Whitbread's notable plan we ſhall extract.

"But this article, 5, muſt be produced at full length: for, being coupled with other parts of the bill, it ſeems to contain a proviſion which the honourable mover would be aſtoniſhed to hear of, and which he would not eaſily forgive to thoſe among his counſellors by whom it was impoſed upon him. 'Article 5—That the ſaid juſtices ſhall not be authoriſed, for any of the purpoſes aforeſaid, to order the payment or expenditure within one year, of a greater ſum than can be raiſed by a rate or aſſeſſment of *one ſhilling* in the pound upon the true annual value and produce of the rateable property within

the pariſh, *unleſs the inhabitants of ſuch pariſh in veſtry ſhall have conſented thereto.*' P. 3. Now add a little clauſe at page 7, fol. 20.—'And be it further enacted, That all the purchaſe money, rent, and other charges and expences of purchaſing and hiring buildings for ſuch ſchools, and of purchaſing ground for the erection of ſuch buildings, and of repairing and fitting up the buildings to be appropriated, hired, or purchaſed, for the purpoſes aforeſaid, and the ſalaries and rewards of the maſters and miſtreſſes to be appointed, and all other the charges and expences of, and incident to, ſuch ſchools within every pariſh reſpectively, ſhall be paid by the churchwardens and overſeers of every pariſh, *out of the money to be raiſed therein for the relief of the poor.*' By whom, then, is the expence of building, or buying, and of maintaining ſchools, to be *ultimately* defrayed, within very populous pariſhes, where the poor rate is already enormouſly high? eſpecially ſince the yearly expenditure may, *with conſent of the inhabitants*, amount not only to *one* ſhilling in the pound upon the poor rate, but to *ten* ſhillings; that is, to a ſum without limitation? Would not any one expect that *thoſe inhabitants, and no others*, are to defray the expence of ſchools for their children? *No ſuch thing, but the very reverſe*, is provided for by this bill; if the meaning of the clauſes be truly ſtated in the margin. For at page 20, fol. 66, we find (as is briefly ſtated in the margin) that 'Pariſhes paying to the poor's rates more than double the average of the county, may apply to the quarter ſeſſions; where the juſtices may give relief out of the county ſtock.' 'Provided that the ſum ſo ordered to be paid ſhall in no caſe be more than ſufficient to reduce the money to be raiſed by the inhabitants of the pariſh, to whom ſuch payment ſhall be allowed, to leſs than double the average amount in the pound of the poor's rates and aſſeſſments throughout the country, according to ſuch laſt returns and eſtimates thereof made.' P. 21.

"Suppoſe, then, that the average of the poor's rates throughout any county is *five* ſhillings in the pound, and the rates at preſent exiſting in any pariſh crowded with poor are *thirty* ſhillings, it will be a matter of indifference to this pariſh, whether the expence of ſchools ſhall add *one* ſhilling, or *five*, or *ten*, to the rate. Scarcely a farthing will ultimately fall upon the pariſh; which will ſtill be entitled to receive, from the county ſtock, enough to reduce the money raiſed in it to double the average of the county.

"If then theſe ſeveral clauſes ſhall be adopted, the county will pay the expence of ſchools in very populous towns, where diſaffection to church and king are moſt likely to be inculcated on young minds; whilſt well-ordered villages in the ſame counties, where the ſcattered cottagers cannot make up one ſchool, will pay their ſhares of the rate. *Land-owners!* attend to this circumſtance, and to many others in this moſt extraordinary bill. Never, perhaps, did any proceeding in parliament more ſtrongly call for *your* attention in particular, and for that of all who are attached to our preſent conſtitution in Church and State.

"It would be conſolatory, to believe that this was an *overſight* in

the *framers* of the bill, (for ſurely the honourable mover had little ſhare in framing it) but it requires a vaſt ſtretch of charity to believe ſo, when the intereſts of ſome parts of the community are ſo completely ſacrificed to other parts, in all the principal proviſions of the bill.

"It does not appear what ſort of *religious inſtruction* is to be given to the children. But article 10 ſeems to ſhew, that children, whoſe parents are of the Eſtabliſhed Church, and thoſe whoſe parents are ſectaries of any denomination whatever, are to be educated together in the ſame ſchool, and by the ſame maſter or miſtreſs. Now as the miniſter, churchwardens, and overſeers of each pariſh are to have the firſt part in recommending maſters and miſtreſſes, and in framing rules with reſpect to the courſe of inſtruction, we muſt ſuppoſe they will prefer thoſe *teachers* who are of the Church of England; and will alſo recommend ſuch *books* to be uſed as appear to them moſt inſtructive and unexceptionable; among which they can hardly fail to number the *Church Catechiſm*. But what will ſectaries ſay to this? Doubtleſs they will object to ſuch a proceeding. Why then does not the bill obviate all miſunderſtandings, by determining this point—whether children, educated at the national charge, ſhould be educated as members of the National Church, after the example of Scotland, recommended in the preamble? On this ſubject, every one who conſiders attentively the bill in queſtion will do well if he provides and carefully peruſes a letter from John Bowles, Eſq. to Samuel Whitbread, Eſq. ſold by Hatchard, Rivingtons, &c."

The new obſervations, reſpecting the extenſion of the poor-rate to perſonal property, a meaſure that would be attended with inſurmountable difficulties, are entitled to attention.

"P. 19, fol. 60. This clauſe requires explanation and enlargement, more than any other in the whole bill. As to rating *all perſonal property* (except farming ſtock), how are overſeers, changed every year, to become acquainted with money put out at *intereſt*, particularly in the *funds*, which is inveſted there in one month, and elſewhere in the next? What is to be done with *profits of profeſſions*, *quit rents*, and *profits of manors*, and other *inviſible* ſorts of property? Perhaps this clauſe will ſuggeſt to us a mainſpring of the late increaſe in *the pound* of poor-rates; namely, the immenſe increaſe of perſonal property *not rateable*, or, at leaſt, not actually rated, on account of the difficulty. Suppoſe the income from the unrated property of all deſcriptions, including the funds, to have been advanced, within a given period, twenty millions a year. The receivers of this income create a great number of chargeable poor, in the ſhape of artiſans, labourers, domeſtics, &c. but pay no rate, except a trifle for their dwelling-houſes. The total amount of the rate is advanced in a moſt high degree; and continues to fall, with this exception, on thoſe kinds of property alone, which in former times were actually rated. If the poor-rate were on the ſame footing with the property tax; and if the profits of *trade* were diſcoverable; then the burthen upon property now rated would be light indeed; and all perſons would bear it *in pro-*

portion to their ability, and to the ſhare which they have in creating it. Something might have been added alſo in this clauſe concerning *ſhipping*, on which ſubject difficulties often ariſe; and in numberleſs places they are not rated at all; though ſhip-owners bring heavy charges upon a pariſh, by giving *ſettlements* to their *apprentices.*"

We again recommend this pamphlet to the ſerious attention of our legiſlators, who ought to reflect long and deeply upon a ſubject before they come to any deciſion upon it.

Official Letters, written by Lieut.-Col. Henry Haldane, Captain of Royal Invalid Engineers, to the Maſters-General of his Majeſty's Ordnance, ſince the Year 1802. 8vo. Pp. 132. 2s. Harding. 1807.

THE ſubject of theſe Letters is the omiſſion to include Lieutenant-Colonel Haldane in the general brevet promotions, becauſe he was only a Captain of Royal Invalid Engineers, although he had obtained a higher rank in the army by brevet. He urges many ſtrong reaſons, as well as ſome precedents, againſt his excluſion; but it was the opinion of ſucceſſive Maſters of the Ordnance, as well as of the Commander in Chief, and of the King himſelf, (to whom the matter was referred by a memorial from L. Col. Haldane) that ſuch promotion would be contrary to the eſtabliſhed rules of the ſervice. However we may lament ſuch a deciſion (and who that conſiders that this brave officer has ſerved his King and country *two and thirty years*, and has a large family, and a ſmall income, will not lament it?), it is impoſſible for us to queſtion either its propriety or its juſtice.

An Appendix to a Practical Eſſay on Diſtortion of the Legs and Feet of Children, &c. Containing ſixty-two Caſes that have been ſucceſsfully treated in Patients between the Ages of two Weeks and twenty-five Years, &c. By T. Sheldrake, Truſs Maker to the Weſtminſter Hoſpital. Pp. 176. 8vo. Thirty-two Plates. Sold by the Author at No. 50, Strand, and at No. 5, Montague-ſtreet, Ruſſel-ſquare. 1806.

MR. T. Sheldrake's Caſes of Diſtortion, whether ſucceſsful or unſucceſsful, are related with much perſpicuity, candour, modeſty, and apparent reſpect for truth. The importance of rendering diſtorted limbs ſerviceable to the unfortunate patient muſt be ſelf-evident to the commoneſt obſerver. To parents who have the painful duty of ſupporting a deformed offſpring, it muſt be conſoling to ſee their children, through the means uſed by this ingenious artiſt, not only relieved from weakneſs and diſeaſe, but reſtored to health, vigour, and the natural beauty of the human figure, which has ſuch an influence on ſociety. Nor can it be ungrateful to the general philanthropiſt to learn that in the courſe of a few years not leſs than ſixty-two perſons have been cured by the exertions of our author. The particular nature of theſe diſeaſes and cures is exhibited by the

plates, in outlines, drawn from models taken from the different limbs, both before and after the cures. Mr. T. Sheldrake has obtained a patent for the inſtruments which he uſes in reſtoring diſtorted feet and legs to the natural poſition. When we conſider that medical men in general have thought theſe things unworthy their attention, that very little ſcience has yet been exerciſed in the conſtruction of truſſes and inſtruments for improving crooked limbs, and that they are generally made by mere mechanics, who have no anatomical knowledge, we can diſcover no reaſon why an ingenious and regularly educated gentleman, who may have made ſome uſeful diſcoveries in this neglected department of medical ſcience, ſhould not meet with every encouragement which circumſtances may admit, or the nature of the ſubject deſerve. This, however, to the prejudice of the public as well as the author, has not been the caſe; and he complains with much apparent juſtice of the improper conduct of his near relation, and alſo of a nominal editor of a medical journal. With theſe *perſonal* matters it is not our province to interfere, and if it were, we ſhould not decide, in ſuch a ſtriking caſe, on ex-parte evidence. We were rather ſurpriſed, indeed, to find that the author had been engaged in a controverſy with one of his colleagues at the Weſtminſter Hoſpital, a man of real talents, and formerly a very ſanguine, now a very diffident practitioner, but ſtill with a mind very ſuperior to the other profeſſor here alluded to. We acknowledge, however, both the juſtneſs and talents diſplayed in Mr. Sheldrake's remarks (p. 122-3) on that gentleman's letter. Upon the whole, we can only recommend this work to the attention of medical practitioners, and perſons who may have friends or connections labouring under the infirmities which the author propoſes to cure or remedy. We regret to ſtate the fact, that there are more perſons in England labouring under bodily deformity, than in moſt other countries of Europe; yet in no other can there be found better organized bodies in general.

DIVINITY.

A Sermon, preached before the Lords Spiritual and Temporal, at the Abbey Church, Weſtminſter, on Friday, January 30, 1807. By the Biſhop of St. David's. 4to. Pp. 26. Rivingtons.

THIS is an eloquent and impreſſive diſcourſe, on a moſt ſolemn and important ſubject, from the 10th chapter of Eccleſiaſticus, ver. 8. For what purpoſe, and from what motive, the annual ſermon, which had, for more than a century, been preached on this day, was diſcontinued, we never could divine. We noticed the circumſtance at the time, and expreſſed our ſentiments upon it with a freedom which the occaſion not only juſtified but required. We are well pleaſed that it has been reſumed, at the expreſs deſire of our gra-

cious Sovereign, who is, not *nominally*, but *efficiently*, THE DEFENDER OF THE FAITH; and that it fell to the lot of the learned Biſhop of St. David's to preach the firſt ſermon after its reſumption. His Lordſhip has diſcharged this ſerious duty with effect; he ſtates unanſwerable reaſons for the obſervance of the day; traces the ſins of the nation from the murder of our Firſt Charles to the preſent reign; and ſhews that no marks of repentance for the commiſſion of that abominable act have been viſible during that interval. "The murder of our lawful Sovereign is therefore," ſays his Lordſhip, "ſtill a ſufficient cauſe for our repentance, even if we had no additional ſins of our own. But (excluſive of the prevailing ſins of the preſent day) the unfortunate connection which the death of Charles has with a ſimilar event of late years, ought to fill us with ſorrow and remorſe for the ſhare it may have had in contributing to the preſent calamitous ſtate of Europe."

In enumerating the ſins of the nation, at the preſent time, the Biſhop conſiders as the moſt prevalent "the profanation of the Sabbath by worldly occupations and entertainments; the neglect of church; the neglect of the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper; and the neglect of the Scriptures, and of family prayer." On theſe he delivers ſuitable admonitions, and earneſt exhortations to repentance and amendment; and then adverts to other grounds of offence.

"In all countries laws were inſtituted in ſupport of religion and morality, of civil and ſocial rights. The laws of a Chriſtian people ſhould, therefore, never be at variance with the laws of the Goſpel; yet in this country there exiſts more than one law directly contrary to the word of God, and none more flagrantly ſo than that by which a crime, which God has placed at the head of mortal ſins, is reduced to the claſs of civil miſdemeanours; a crime which God has ſentenced to excluſion from Heaven, is tolerated by a pecuniary fine. We reproach, and juſtly, the Church of Rome, for its ſale of indulgences and pardons, yet, by an inconſiſtency which is diſgraceful to our laws, the puniſhment of one of the greateſt offences againſt religion and morality (and which in many other polities has been puniſhed with death or infamy) is commuted for money."

It is a diſgrace to our ſenate that any attempt to remedy this evil, by rendering the law, on the ſubject of adultery, more conformable to the ſpirit of the Goſpel, is ſure to be treated with levity, and rejected with ſcorn. Some buffoon in the one Houſe, who thinks morality the beſt theme for ridicule; or ſome debauchee in the other, who leads a life of habitual, ſyſtematic profligacy, without reſerve and without ſhame, riſes to reſiſt it, and, by ſophiſtry that would diſgrace an infidel, perſuades the members to reject the propoſal!

"Another great ſubject of regret and repentance is the deſtitute condition of the Proteſtant Church in our Eaſt India poſſeſſions. There is reaſon to fear that in the government of that country we have always been more ſolicitous for the improvement of our commerce, and the extent of our empire, than for the honour of God,

in the furtherance of his Goſpel, by the religious inſtruction of the natives, and the ſecurity of an Eſtabliſhed Church."

There is indeed reaſon to fear this; nay, there is good reaſon to *know* that this is really the fact; and that, in that immenſe empire, containing above 30 millions of ſouls, not the ſmalleſt pains have been taken by the Eaſt India Company to provide for the religious inſtruction either of Europeans or of natives. From all the wealth which they have acquired, from all the conqueſts which they have made, not a ſingle church has been endowed. The inattention to religion diſplayed by the Company is moſt ſcandalous. The Biſhop obſerves in a note, "It is ſaid, to the honour of Marquis Welleſley's government of India, that conſiderable progreſs was made, under his patronage, in the eſtabliſhment of ſchools for the religious inſtruction of the natives." This is true: the noble Marquis exerted his utmoſt efforts for the diffuſion of religious knowledge in the Eaſt, and the eſtabliſhment of the college at Calcutta was admirably calculated for ſeconding his exertions, by training up miniſters for the church. But in that, as in many other ſchemes of improvement, his Lordſhip was perpetually thwarted by the Company, who will never reſt till they have totally ſuppreſſed that excellent eſtabliſhment. We truſt we ſhall ſee the whole of our Indian empire excluſively ſubject to the King of Great Britain, when, and when alone, proper proviſions will be made for the religious inſtruction of its inhabitants. It is a fact, not ſufficiently known, that a Director of the Eaſt India Company had once the profligacy to declare, at a public diſcuſſion, that the introduction of Chriſtianity in the Eaſt would render the natives troubleſome, and bad ſubjects, averſe from ſubordination, and would conſequently be injurious to the intereſts of the Company!

At the cloſe of this excellent diſcourſe, the worthy prelate thus ſums up, as it were, the *evil* and the *remedy*.

"The ſins of paſt generations and [of] the preſent have brought Europe to a criſis, from which nothing but the arm of Divine Providence can extricate us; and we have no room to hope for God's protection, but by following his earneſt invitations to repentance and obedience. Let us then reſtore to the Sabbath and its various duties the honour that is due to them, and to family religion its ancient efficacy. Let us ceaſe to pervert truth; to confound the diſtinctions of right and wrong; to lower the ſtandard of moral virtue; to corrupt the public mind; to inſult the authority of God, and of his Scriptures; and to diſhonour the Proteſtant cauſe, by ſinking crimes into civil miſdemeanours, and granting indulgences to vice by pecuniary commutations. Let us extend to our colonies the bleſſings of religion and rational liberty, and to our religious inſtitutions there the ſecurity of legal eſtabliſhment. Let every one in his place and calling conſider himſelf as bound to contribute his ſpecial ſhare of duties to the honour of God, and to the ſervice of his country."

The ſhort extracts which we have made ſufficiently teſtify the merits of this Sermon, to render any recommendation of ours perfectly unneceſſary.

REVIEWERS REVIEWED.

Monthly Review for December, 1807. ART. 27, *on "Strictures on the Motions made in the laſt Parliament reſpecting the Pledge which His Majeſty was under the Neceſſity of demanding from his late Miniſters, &c. In a Letter to the Right Hon. Lord Viſcount Howick. By John Bowles, Eſq."* 2*s*. Stockdale, Pall-Mall.

BY the retort courteous which Mr. Bowles, in the Supplementary Obſervations annexed to his Second Letter to Mr. Whitbread, has given to the Monthly and Critical Reviewers, the controverſy reſpecting Mr. Lancaſter's Syſtem of Education is brought to iſſue upon a queſtion which the public will have no difficulty in deciding. Mr. Bowles, in his firſt letter, had objected to this ſyſtem, that as its fundamental principle was to inſtruct youth only in the *uncontroverted* doctrines of Chriſtianity, its adoption would prevent their being brought up as Chriſtians. The Monthly and Critical Reviewers have denied this concluſion; they have defended and ſtrongly recommended Mr. Lancaſter's plan of religious education, and have ridiculed as moſt prepoſterous the ſuppoſition that an education which keeps back all knowledge of doctrines that are controverted would be unfavourable to the intereſts of Chriſtianity: nay, the Critical Reviewers have expreſsly maintained that the truths in which all denominations of profeſſing Chriſtians are agreed, that is to ſay, the doctrines which are not controverted, "conſtitute the only *eſſentials* of Chriſtianity." Mr. Bowles, in his reply, has joined iſſue with them upon this very point, and has moreover charged his antagoniſts with maintaining the Socinian Creed, by denying that the doctrines of the Trinity, the atonement and the divinity of our Saviour, which are certainly *controverted*, are eſſential. The diſpute therefore hinges upon this queſtion; are theſe controverted doctrines *eſſential?* or rather are they true? for if true, as Mr. B. juſtly obſerves, they muſt be eſſential. Mr. B., in conformity with our church, maintains the affirmative, and the reviewers, agreeing with the Socinians, aſſert the negative, of the above queſtion. It cannot be doubted which opinion will prevail in this country, and the controverſy would, in effect, be nugatory, if it did not lead to a deciſion upon the true merits of a plan of education, which has been patronized by many well-diſpoſed perſons, who it muſt be preſumed were not aware of its real tendency, and which, we hope it will be remember-

ed, we have uniformly condemned. In their defence of that ſyſtem, the Monthly and Critical Reviewers do not deny that it would have the effect which Mr. B. attributed to it, that of keeping youth in utter ignorance of doctrines which the Chriſtian Church in all ages has conſidered, and ſtill conſiders, as eſſential and fundamental truths of the Goſpel; with a knowledge of this effect they vindicate the ſyſtem. But we can never believe that the country will join with them in wiſhing to ſee the riſing generation ſo educated. We ſhall however wait with impatience the arrival of another month, being curious to ſee in what manner the Reviewers will meet the charge of Socinianiſm which Mr. B. has brought againſt them.

In the mean while we think it our duty to notice the obſervations of the Monthly Reviewers, in their laſt number, on Mr. Bowles's Strictures on the Motions of Mr. Brand and the Marquis of Stafford reſpecting the Pledge which His Majeſty was under the Neceſſity of demanding from his late Miniſters. In this tract Mr. B. had ſhewn, by a regular and well-connected chain of reaſoning, that the late Miniſters had actually reduced the King to the alternative of either diſmiſſing them inſtantly from his councils, or of requiring the pledge which he demanded from them; and the author moſt juſtly obſerves that in reſorting to the milder expedient "His Majeſty acted with a lenity and forbearance truly deſcriptive of the character which he has always maintained," and that "the exaction of ſuch a pledge, under ſuch circumſtances, was truly an act of grace and favour," which, however, was moſt ungratefully as well as unconſtitutionally requited, by being made a ſubject of accuſation, and an occaſion for motions which, had they been carried, would have had the effect of putting the Sovereign of theſe realms upon his trial before his parliament.

As the Monthly Reviewers ſtand forward not only on this but on every other occaſion as the advocates of the late Miniſtry, it was to be expected that they would endeavour to ſhield that Miniſtry againſt ſuch weighty charges. But, ſtrange to tell, they paſs by thoſe charges and the reaſoning by which they are ſupported without a ſingle obſervation. How expreſſive is this ſilence! How concluſively does it prove that the Reviewers found it impoſſible to furniſh even a plauſible reply to that reaſoning!

It may be aſked, perhaps, how theſe critics, if they have omitted to notice the main ſubject of the pamphlet under conſideration, can be ſaid to have reviewed that pamphlet. We heartily wiſh that ſpecimens of ſuch reviewing were not frequent. But whoever is in the habit of conſulting the Monthly Reviewers, in order to form an opinion of the publications of the day, muſt know that they often ſubſtitute *abuſe* for *criticiſm*. On the preſent occaſion, finding themſelves unable to refute the author, they endeavour to

diſcredit him, by diſparaging his motives. They aſſume that he takes up his pen ſolely under the impulſe of party feelings. They repreſent him as a ſervile and grovelling writer, always obſequious to "the powers that be," who would never offend the Miniſter of the day, and who, if Lord Howick had been in office at the date of his letter, would have taken care to ſay ſome civil things to his Lordſhip, inſtead of making him an object of cenſure. We ſhall not pay Mr. Bowles ſo bad a compliment as to think it neceſſary to vindicate him againſt ſuch imputations. We ſhall not pay the diſcernment of our readers ſo bad a compliment, as to ſuppoſe that they can fail to perceive in all Mr. Bowles's writings an independence of mind which renders him ſuperior to any other influence than that of principle, to any other impulſe than a ſincere deſire to promote the true intereſts of his country. Thoſe perſons indeed muſt be ſtrangely blinded by prejudice who cannot diſcover concluſive proofs of the independent ſpirit of this writer, even at the time when his defence of the adminiſtration of Mr. Pitt, whom the Reviewers term his "munificent benefactor," drew upon him the charge of being a miniſterial writer. It is well known that from the very commencement of the revolutionary war with France, and for years afterwards, Mr. B. ſtrenuouſly and inceſſantly contended, in all his political writings, that the war ought to be conducted upon a principle which Mr. Pitt invariably diſclaimed, and that the reſtoration of the Houſe of Bourbon ſhould moſt explicitly be made its avowed object. To recommend to the combined powers the adoption of this ſyſtem of policy, as affording them the only means of preſervation from that revolutionary power which ſought the ſubverſion of every legitimate government, was the main ſcope and deſign of all the tracts which he publiſhed at that intereſting period; and it cannot be denied that thoſe tracts moſt clearly evince the independence of his mind, proving that he wrote ſolely from the impulſe of his own conviction and feelings.

The Monthly Reviewers, however, endeavour to make him appear ſo much the reverſe of independent, that they attribute the attack on Lord Howick, which is contained in the pamphlet before us, to the effect produced on his mind by the change of adminiſtration, aſſuming that, if the late miniſters had continued in power, that attack would never have been made. They ſeem however to forget that the *cauſe* of the attack, the motions of Mr. Brand and the Marquis of Stafford in accuſation of their Sovereign, did not occur till *after* thoſe miniſters were diſmiſſed from His Majeſty's councils. But no unprejudiced perſon we believe will doubt that though their diſmiſſion had not taken place, Mr. B. would with equal ſeverity have cenſured the motions which he ſo juſtly conſiders as an invaſion of the conſtitutional inviolability of his Sovereign.

Certain it is that when the queſtion which gave riſe to thoſe

motions arose between the King and his ministers, Mr. B. lost not a moment in expressing himself most decidedly upon that question, as may be seen in his first letter to Mr. Whitbread, which was evidently written *before* the change of administration took place.

The passage in Mr. B.'s Letter to Lord Howick which seems most to displease the Monthly Reviewers is that in which he says to his Lordship, "I cannot forget that the principles of the party with which your Lordship has so long acted are essentially repugnant to the inviolability of the sacred person of Majesty. I could mention some distinguished members of that party who, in those inflammatory speeches which their extravagant admiration of the French revolution drew from them both in and out of parliament, have laboured frequently to convert our revolution in 1688 into an authority for the treasonable doctrine that *the people of this country have a right to cashier their Sovereign for misconduct*: in fact, according to the principles of the party to which I allude, no Majesty is sacred but the majesty of the people—no Sovereign impeccable but that popular multitude, whose sovereignty was the long standing toast of these modern Whigs."

The main fact relied on in the above passage, respecting the construction which has been put by some distinguished members of the Modern Whig party on the revolution in 1688 is incontestible. The Reviewers we believe will not have the hardihood to deny that Mr. Fox has repeatedly, in the manner here stated, so construed that revolution; and unless this fact be denied, the inference which Mr. B. deduces from it follows of course, viz. that the principles of the party of which Mr. Fox was the head, are essentially repugnant to the inviolability of the sacred person of Majesty.

But the question is soon afterwards relieved of all doubt by the Reviewers themselves, who boldly avow the doctrine "that the people of this country have a right to cashier their Sovereign for misconduct," and in the genuine manner of Mr. Fox contend that the revolution was a practical exposition of that doctrine. We presume they will scarcely complain that injustice is done to the character of Mr. Fox by ascribing to him principles which are maintained by themselves; and those who assert that the king is liable to be cashiered for misconduct will have little credit for sincerity when they *profess* to believe that his person is inviolable.

Before we close this article we think it proper to notice a specimen of *candid* criticism on the part of the Monthly Reviewers. They intimate their suspicions that "his newly recovered liberty (in consequence of the change of administration) has made Mr. B. frantic"—We rather suspect that effect to have been thereby produced upon some other persons—but with regard to him they infer

this calamity to have taken place becauſe he makes the notable diſcovery "that it is clearly beyond the competence of parliament to entertain a bill to repeal the corporation and teſt acts." The boldneſs of this aſſertion is certainly calculated to ſtagger thoſe who conſider it merely, as it here appears, in the form of a ſubſtantive propoſition. But in the letter, inſtead of appearing in that form, it is made the concluſion from premiſes previouſly eſtabliſhed, and without a reference to which it is impoſſible to judge fairly of that concluſion. The author having quoted an act of parliament (10 Ann. c. 2.) by which it is expreſsly declared that the *teſt laws* were made "*for the ſecurity of the Church of England as by law eſtabliſhed*," and thence inferred that "the Sovereign who ſhould conſent to their repeal would break his engagement to maintain, *to the utmoſt of his power*, the religion eſtabliſhed by law;" he proceeds to obſerve that "the obligation of the coronation oath is not confined to the Sovereign; parliament (he ſays) is the legiſlative council of the King. And it would be prepoſterous beyond all deſcription of abſurdity, to maintain that this council can, conſiſtently with its duty, adviſe the Sovereign to violate his coronation oath."

From theſe premiſes, which we conceive cannot be denied, he deduces the incompetence of parliament "to paſs, and of courſe *even to entertain*, a bill to repeal the corporation and teſt acts." The above premiſes, however, the Reviewers take care to ſuppreſs, although on their validity depends entirely the juſtneſs of the concluſion; and even in ſtating the naked concluſion they are guilty of miſrepreſentation, for they make Mr. B. to ſay "it is clearly beyond the competence of parliament *to entertain* a bill," &c. but the author's words are, it is clearly beyond the competence of parliament to paſs, and, *of courſe, to entertain a bill*, making the incompetence to entertain an inference from the inability to paſs—an inference ſurely which cannot be controverted.

The manner in which the Reviewers "take their leave of Mr. Bowles," exhibits ſo curious a ſpecimen of the art of ſinking, not indeed in poetry, but in criticiſm, that we cannot refrain from noticing it for the amuſement of our readers. Senſible that they had failed altogether to invalidate Mr. B.'s reaſoning, they again aſſail him with perſonalities, and they deſcend ſo low as to vent their ſpleen on the "comforts" enjoyed by him in private life, the poſſeſſion of which, they attribute, with unparalleled abſurdity, to "his connection with the dominant religion." How paltry, how diſgraceful to the critical character is this! To Mr. B. indeed it is complimentary and flattering in a very high degree, for it amounts to an avowal that they found his publication unanſwerable. But their diſappointment in making this diſcovery ſeems to have bereft them of their ſenſes. Elſe how could they have ſuppoſed it poſſible for Mr. B. to derive any perſonal advantage from his connection with the eſtabliſhed Church? Do they ſuſpect that

he is penſioned by the biſhops and the opulent clergy of the eſtabliſhment? Or do they deem it impoſſible for any man to ſupport any cauſe from diſintereſted motives? Venal as the age undoubtedly is, we truſt that inſtances are not wanting which prove that it is groſsly libelled by ſuch an imputation. At all events, we conceive that when a layman ſtands forward as the champion of the Church, the preſumption that he is free from the bias of ſelfiſh conſiderations is irreſiſtible.

CATHOLIC EMANCIPATION—AND THE EDINBURGH REVIEWERS.

A Letter to the Edinburgh Reviewer.

THE grand profeſſor of *illumination*, Weyſhaupt, has ſucceeded in France, Germany, and Italy, &c. beyond the expectation of his moſt ſanguine diſciples; for the Roman world, under Nero, Domitian, and the other imperial monſters, was free and happy, compared to the preſent ſtate of France, and the countries now under the tyranny of the ſavage and baſe-born Corſican.

The proceſs of illuminating the public underſtanding was attempted in England by one of the moſt zealous diſciples of Weyſhaupt, Thomas Paine, but fortunately England was not degenerated like the Continent; for moral and religious principles had taken deep root in the ſound and rational part of the country, which is certainly the majority of it; and by theſe was the nation preſerved.--The conduct of profligates in high life never has any influence, from the conſideration of rank, on the good ſenſe of Engliſhmen; inſtead of imitating their profligacy, they treat it with contempt, and no rank, birth, or ſtation, can ſhelter the abandoned villain from their juſt abhorrence and indignation.—This was not the caſe in other countries.—Though Paine failed in England, Fitzgerald, O'Connor, and the other diſciples of the German philoſopher, with the Rights of Man and Age of Reaſon, had more ſucceſs in Ireland: they boaſted of their *glorious* rebellion there, and ſent ambaſſadors to the *mild and virtuous* Robeſpierre—but though they were caſt down they were not deſtroyed; for the *righteous* cauſe of radical reform and Catholic emancipation is ſtill maintained, by ſome few in parliament, and by many *illuminated* writers in daily, weekly and monthly effuſions from the preſs, that great bleſſing thus converted into a curſe.—The Edinburgh Reviewer indeed is now ſo ſanguine, that he ſcruples not to ſay in page 117, No. 21, "that he does not entertain the ſlighteſt doubt of the ultimate ſucceſs of the Catholics in their claim of emancipation." Horne Took, Burdett, Paul, and All the Talents, will of courſe give their aſſiſtance—thus reaſon they ſay, in the age of reaſon, muſt be triumphant, for reaſon produced the reformation. Excellent! The reformation! what, was this reformation? was it

Catholic emancipation, or was it not emancipation from Catholics? How different is this goddeſs Reaſon in different ages! At the reformation ſhe cried "No Popery" with ſome ſucceſs; but Lord Howick and the new philoſophers ſay, that this is a ſenſeleſs and a beaſtly cry, therefore the cry of "Popery for ever" ſhould be the order of the day. Give, then, the Catholics all they aſk, and all they want, that is, give them power, δος που σω, is all they deſire, and then they will not only move the earth, but heaven and hell alſo, to accompliſh all their wiſhes;—give them power, and we ſhall ſee them, as they have ever been, if they are true to their religion and their conſciences, we ſhall ſee them ſtraining every nerve, *per fas atque nefas*, to overthrow and exterminate the Proteſtant religion.

The Reviewer next gives a confuſed account of the incapacities to which the Catholics have formerly been ſubjected, and likewiſe the liſt of their preſent diſabilities, (p. 121). But this excluſion from the *higheſt* offices of power in the ſtate can extend only to a few individuals, therefore the maſs or multitude do not feel it, nor do they even know what emancipation is; but they now ſerve their country in great numbers both in the army and navy, as bravely and willingly as other ſubjects: but give to theſe few ambitious individuals the power they want, and we ſhall then ſee the extent of their influence, and poſſibly Proteſtant extermination may ſoon follow Catholic emancipation;—for even now we ſee the Proteſtant Bible attacked in a publication that would diſgrace the dark ages, yet more than 100 Catholic prieſts, beſides many other eminent Catholics, now openly ſupport it with their names as ſubſcribers: this work, under the title of Ward's Errata of the Proteſtant Bible, declares that our Bible is all forgery and falſehood:—ſuch is the licentiouſneſs of the preſs of this preſent day.

The Reviewer next endeavours to perſuade the body of Catholics, who would be quiet and happy if they would let them alone, that they ought and muſt be diſcontented and full of reſentment againſt our good King and his miniſters. This is ſomething in the ſtyle of the razor-grinder, of facetious memory. In fact, the Catholics in general are contented with their preſent toleration and advantages; but there is a French party among them, as Mr. Grattan acknowledged in Parliament: theſe men would be ſatisfied with nothing ſhort of abſolute independence, which the idiots would not long enjoy, if they could accompliſh it, for the tyrant who aſſiſted them would ſoon be able to number them alſo among his ſlaves.

The Reviewer is not ſatisfied with the charge that the Catholics are excluded from the *higheſt* offices of power, but now, he ſays, they are excluded from *all* offices of honour and dignity, ſo he is determined to rouſe them if he can, even by falſehood: how low will an advocate ſometimes deſcend, to ſupport a bad cauſe! He next aſcribes the French revolution to a ſimilar excluſion of the lower orders from places of dignity and power. No, no,

Mr. Reviewer: that revolution was engendered in the loweſt pit of hell; the deep deſigning author of it worked with various tools, to accompliſh ſuch a grand ſcheme of miſchief: ſome were radical reformers, ſome were mock philanthropiſts, profeſſing refined morality and *douce humanité*; ſome were periodical writers and journaliſts; and the preſs groaned with every thing baſe and infamous, as it does at this day. But the ſapient Edinburgh Reviewer and his wife colleague, the Rev. Squire Plymley, aſcribe this tremendous revolution to no leſs a perſonage than the Roturier—he was a degraded being, they ſay; and becauſe he could not be prime miniſter of the country, he kicked up all this horrible revolution.—This is curious.—But the Reviewer, who is ſo deeply ſkilled in cauſes and conſequences, ventures to predict ſimilar conſequences from the rejection of the Catholic claims; indeed, he has no heſitation to declare it to be certain, for, he ſays, the magiſtracy in Ireland is obnoxious, and the blood-hounds of the Orange faction, that is, the Iriſh Proteſtants, are ſtill careſſed at the Caſtle—he ſeems to have forgotten the Catholic blood-hounds and Lord Kilwarden, &c. &c. &c. but he produces a ſpeech made by Lord Gosford, juſt after the rebellion, *nine* years ſince, repreſenting the horrid ſcenes that were at that time acting in the country; and the following words are marked in italics, "*theſe horrors are now acting with impunity:*" theſe italics were intended to deceive careleſs readers, to induce them to think that the preſent ſtate of Ireland is the ſame as it was about the time of the rebellion; and he afterwards adds, "if ſuch be the actual ſtate of Ireland, then we may aſſume our firſt propoſition to be completely eſtabliſhed, namely, that all the diſcontents are ſufficiently accounted for.—To ſuch miſerable ſhifts and tricks as this deception is the Reviewer now reduced.

The ſecond propoſition, for removing the diſabilities, will ſtand on no better foundation than the firſt. Now the Reviewer talks of the non-reſidence of the landed proprietors and of the clergy; but how can thoſe clergy reſide who have no glebe houſes? He appears to be entirely ignorant of the nature of tithes; their value he muſt be informed is fixed by a maximum, nor can any man, whether clergyman, middleman or proctor, or any other perſon, exact more than the tenth of the produce; but the owners of land ſometime exact more rent than the land is worth; the clergy always take leſs, but they cannot take more: how then can this be called oppreſſion? for the landlord, when he buys his eſtate, buys it with this expreſſed incumbrance; and the tenant, who occupies the land, knows that one tenth of his crops is due, by the laws of the land, for tithe; he therefore pays his landlord leſs rent in proportion: and if he defrauds the tithe-owner of his due, he robs him of his juſt demand.—If the attempt of the land proprietors ſhould ſucceed in forcing a commutation for tithes, the poor tenants will have reaſon to curſe the day of commutation; for they will immediately pay the land-proprietor more than double what they ever paid before for tithes: this is proved from the advanced rents at which all tithe-free lands

are let, and from the ſtate of France when the church lands were alienated.

But now, reader, attend to what the Reviewer ſays. If we would but grant this emancipation, he ſays, "it would render *unneceſſary* the military eſtabliſhment which is now there."—Is this the dream of an idiot or the deſign of a knave? Arthur O'Connor himſelf could not have contrived a better plan for the ſurrender of Ireland to France. Grant this emancipation, and *remove the military eſtabliſhment*,—then farewell, dear Ireland, for ever: ſhe would then, indeed, be independent of —— England ——but immediately be the dependent ſlave of France."

The Reviewer next compares the ſtate of Scotland in the time of Charles II to the preſent ſtate of the Catholics in Ireland.—Surely he is ignorant of the hiſtory of theſe times. Charles wanted to alter the religion of the people, and to force epiſcopacy upon them; this attempt they reſiſted, and, inflamed by bigotry and enthuſiaſm, they roſe in rebellion. But in Ireland no one dreamt of altering the religion of any part of the country. Where, then, is the reſemblance?

The Reviewer now ſeems to be in great terror and diſmay, leſt we ſhould be conquered by France, but, he ſays, Ireland muſt fall firſt, becauſe the Catholics are not emancipated. But be of good courage, man: at preſent neither Ireland nor England is in danger. The great military eſtabliſhment in both countries, with our preſent naval ſuperiority, will make it tenfold madneſs, even in the Corſican, to attempt any invaſion.—How bitter is his diſappointment in loſing the fleets of Denmark and Portugal!—And All the Talents ſeem to ſympathiſe with him on the occaſion.—How thankful ought we to be to Providence that ſuch miſerable Talents have not now the direction of our councils!—Under them, we might probably at this moment have been licking the duſt from the feet of the conqueror, or, what is almoſt as diſgraceful, humbly begging for an ignominious peace.

The Reviewer proceeds to the ſubject of that happy event for the nation, the diſmiſſal of the late miniſters:—here he aſſerts what is not true; for, he ſays, they were diſmiſſed for their temerity by introducing the Catholic bill. But they were not diſmiſſed for that attempt, to ſwindle and deceive the King into a meaſure, which his good ſenſe and honeſt conſcience diſapproved of; but they were diſmiſſed, for attempting to fetter the King by a pledge, that he would permit thoſe miniſters to introduce the Catholic queſtion whenever they thought proper: this made it neceſſary for the King, feeling as a conſcientious man and acting with the dignity of a great ſovereign, to demand in his own defence a pledge from them to ſecure him from ſuch an odious meaſure being again introduced.

The Reviewer thinks that the Catholic petition might be granted without infringing on the King's oath.—Then comes a good deal of lawyers quibbling about the force of the coronation oath,

and a fact is produced with great parade, ſtating, that when King William took the coronation oath, the Catholics ſate in parliament in Ireland, and were eligible to all offices :—but this was done by the bigot James, and the Reviewer forgets how theſe men behaved when in power, and how cruelly the Proteſtants were oppreſſed by them, as they always will be, if the Catholics get the aſcendency. But William ſoon put an end to theſe abuſes of power by the acts of the 3d and 4th of his reign, and others were added by the 1ſt and 3d of Anne. When George III took the coronation oath, he ſwore to maintain the Proteſtant religion as eſtabliſhed by the laws then exiſting, not by the laws then repealed ; —thus the King on his oath and in his conſcience muſt maintain the Proteſtant religion, and muſt not endanger it, by giving Catholics power to deſtroy it. But, it ſeems, all that the Catholics want are inſignificant privileges compared to what they now enjoy. Surely, then, they ought to ſit down content with the greater good, like other reaſonable beings. But ſuppoſe the Catholics had the *trifling* privilege of ſending 100 members to parliament. 100 recruits added to any faction would be a ſerious thing, particularly if the leader of it or his brother ſhould be connected by marriage with a Roman Catholic: how ſoon would the iſſue of that marriage imbibe the prejudices of their mother, and all of them becomes dupes to the artful prieſts who attend them, and the Pope takes care that men of ability and addreſs ſhould be in ſuch ſituations. But the Reviewer ſays, it cannot be expected that the poſterity of thoſe great divines, who formerly expoſed the errors of Popery, ſhould now be afraid that the greater part of their flocks ſhould be *reaſoned* back again to Popery : no, it is not the force of reaſon that is to be dreaded ; but power in dangerous hands. Give the Papiſts the power of the inquiſition, and the Mahometan the power of the ſword, and we ſhould ſoon ſee how many converts they would make.

The Reviewer next, from obſerving what he calls the oſcitancy and languor, and abuſes and corruptions of all eſtabliſhed churches, ventures to broach this paradox : he ſays, if the Catholics had been eſtabliſhed in Ireland, as the Preſbyterians were in Scotland, before this time, he thinks the Catholics would have turned Proteſtants, as *we ſee* in Scotland the *Preſbyterians have turned Catholics*.—But it ſeems that the Pope in 1791 and the Catholic univerſities in 1793 declare that it is no tenet of the church that the Pope could abſolve ſubjects from their oath of allegiance, or diſpenſe with their obligation, and that no faith is to be kept with heretics, or that it is lawful for the Pope to invade any ſovereign's *temporal* dominions ; *therefore*, he ſays, *therefore*, gentle reader, there can be no danger in giving the Catholics all they want and wiſh.

But do theſe declarations give ſufficient ſecurity ? what are the tenets now avowed and maintained by the Catholics ?—In recapitulating a few of them, we ſhall ſee the danger of giving power to thoſe who are under the ſtrong influence of ſuch a religion. They ſtill

acknowledge the *ſpiritual* dominion of the Pope, and believe him to be infallible; and all the Catholic clergy ſwear to ſubmit to him in every thing ſpiritual; and part of their ſpiritual duty is to endeavour to exterminate heretics. The words of their oath are, *omnes hereticos ſchiſmaticos et rebelles contra Dominum noſtrum* (the Pope) *pro poſſe perſequar et impugnabo.*—Another part of their duty is to compaſs heaven and earth to make proſelytes, and if any dare to leave their church, they are put under the dreadful ſentence of excommunication, which is certain ruin to them, unleſs they happen to be independent in their fortunes.—In the late rebellion we have ſeen how very miſchievous were the abuſes of auricular confeſſion, and how dangerous was the commanding influence which the prieſts had over their congregations. For as theſe prieſts ſwear obedience to the Pope, whom they think infallible, what can poſſibly be more dangerous at this particular period, when the Pope is a mere tool and inſtrument in the hand of Buonaparte, who knows well the value of ſpiritual dominion: give him then, through the Pope, the command of the ſouls of men, and he will direct their bodies wherever he pleaſes. I need not dwell upon their groſs errors of tranſubſtantiation, purgatory, and ſhutting the gates of heaven againſt all who are not within the pale of their church, their giving as much credit to tradition as to ſcripture, &c. &c. But one might imagine, in an age enlightened by ſcience and learning, there could not remain one individual who has received a liberal education, who could ſtill maintain ſuch abſurd doctrines, in a land of liberty. But in theſe ſtrange times we hear Proteſtants arguing and declaiming in favour of Catholics, and yet continuing Proteſtants; and more inclined to fix their prejudices, than to attempt to remove them:—ſome, indeed, look up to them with veneration, and bring to our recollection the great men whom they have produced in former times, when they were bound in as much ſlavery as the Mahometans under the civil powers. There were great men alſo among the Pagans; therefore, according to this fooliſh reaſoning, we ought to reſpect Paganiſm. But the religion of Catholics, Mahometans, or Pagans, had nothing to do with theſe ſublime geniuſes; theſe few individuals ſtand inſulated in the world, unconnected with religion, with climate, or with government.

Modern Proteſtants not only plead in favour of the Catholics, but endeavour to excite their reſentment againſt us, and force them to be diſcontented: this is the tendency of the Review which has occaſioned theſe remarks; and I will now conclude by telling the Reviewer, that the tools of faction can do no more miſchief now, by keeping up the fooliſh cry againſt the No Popery men; for the diſcerning public only ridicule the idea; and the poor Catholics in Ireland have the ſenſe to be contented with the toleration they enjoy, excepting indeed the French party, who muſt be guarded by the ſtrong arm of power; for reaſon with Jacobins, as Burke obſerved, never had, *and never will* have, influence.

MISCELLANIES.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE ANTI JACOBIN REVIEW.

THE STADT HOUSE AT AMSTERDAM, AND THE CUSTOM HOUSE AT LONDON; OR A HINT FROM MYNHEER TO ALL THE TALENTS.

Sir,

THAT the impreſſions made on the minds of men by external objects addreſſed to the ſenſes are more forcible than thoſe which are excited by internal evidence, or abſtract reaſoning addreſſed to the underſtanding, is univerſally acknowledged. The hiſtory of mankind furniſhes full conviction of this truth; and ſhews that our pureſt ſentiments, even thoſe of devotion itſelf, are exalted by artificial means, and too apt to grow languid without their aſſiſtance.

The Jews, while the miracles by which they were delivered out of the land of Egypt were freſh in their remembrance, while the pillar of cloud went before them by day, and the pillar of fire by night, adored and worſhipped Jehovah. But how ſoon, in the abſence of Moſes, did they prevail upon Aaron to make them a golden calf, and bow before the viſible ſymbol, ſaying "Theſe be thy Gods, O Iſrael." The houſe of Judah brought up the ark of the Lord with ſhouting, and with the ſound of the trumpet; and David danced before it. To muſic, ſinging, and dancing, thus introduced into religious ſolemnities, Solomon added pomp and ſplendour, exhauſting all the arts of magnificence on his temple. Chriſtianity was firſt eſtabliſhed by miracles, by appeals to the ſenſes as well as to reaſon and conſcience. Soon after miracles had ceaſed, pictures and images were uſed as aids to devotion, and Chriſtians, like the Jews of old, transferred their adoration to the works of their own hands: the Proteſtants ſtill retain ſome of the embelliſhments and impreſſive characteriſtics of the Catholic Church; the ten commandments over our altars are decorated with the figures of the great lawgiver and high prieſt of the Jews; the gloom of our Gothic ſtructures fills the mind with veneration; the memorials of mortality that deck their walls, inſpire a ſolemn awe; and the ſwelling notes of the organ lift the rapt ſoul to heaven.

If ſuch be the infirmity of human nature, that even our pureſt feelings are not unmingled with baſer matter, how much leſs can perfection be expected from thoſe whoſe time is abſorbed in ſecular purſuits; and how beneficially might the uſe of ſenſible objects be applied to the purpoſe of inſpiring them, while purſuing their various employments, with ſuch ſentiments, or holding out to them ſuch admonitions, as are beſt adapted to their reſpective ſituations! This ſyſtem is acted upon by all nations in military life, and its advantages are univerſally felt. When the "trumpet's loud clangor excites us to arms," what boſom but glows with martial ardour? The ſame idea may alſo be extended to the civil departments, with equal benefit to the ſtate; and I am happily enabled to point out

the mode in which this may be accompliſhed, from having ever conſidered it my duty to make ſuch obſervations in my travels abroad, as were likely to be conducive to the benefit of my countrymen at home.

In that noble edifice, the Stadt Houſe at Amſterdam, where the courts of juſtice and public offices of every deſcription are concentrated, the talents of the painter and the ſculptor are made ſubſervient to moral purpoſes; and every decoration is admirably calculated to impreſs the minds of the public functionaries with a juſt ſenſe of their reſpective duties. The hall in which criminals are ſentenced to death is embelliſhed with three exquiſite pieces of ſculpture. The firſt repreſents Brutus witneſſing the execution of his two ſons, who had been tried and found guilty of being engaged in a conſpiracy to reſtore the Tarquins. The ſecond repreſents the memorable judgment of Solomon. The third repreſents Seleucus king of the Locrians, who had enacted a law that adulterers ſhould be puniſhed by having their eyes put out, offering one of his own eyes to ſave one of the eyes of his ſon convicted of that offence. In the Hall of Magiſtracy is a painting of Moſes, chuſing, by the advice of Jethro, "ſeventy able men, ſuch as fear God, men of truth, hating covetouſneſs, to judge the people at all ſeaſons, bringing every great matter unto Moſes, but judging every ſmaller matter themſelves." Four other pictures deſcribe the characters required in the magiſtracy. The able man is perſonified by Joſeph, who during the ſeven years of plenty laid up corn in the ſtorehouſes, with which he fed the Egyptians during the ſeven years of famine; thus meriting the eulogium pronounced upon him by Pharaoh, "there is none ſo diſcreet and wiſe as thou art." The man who fears God, is Abraham, who was ready to offer up his only ſon Iſaac at his command. The man of truth is Jeremiah, "girding up his loins, and ſpeaking all that God commanded." The man hating coveteouſneſs, is Eliſha, refuſing the preſent of Naaman the Syrian, and ſaying, "as the Lord liveth before whom I ſtand, I will receive none." In the ſame room, is the chef-d'œuvre of Gobert Flinck, repreſenting Solomon, when God had aſked him, "what ſhall I give thee?" praying for neither long life nor riches, "but for an underſtanding heart, that he might diſcern between good and evil, and judge ſo great a people." In the Treaſury Chamber, is Theſeus, after having deſtroyed the Minotaur, finding his way out of the Cretan labyrinth, by the help of a clue. In the office for Foreign Affairs, is a fine painting by Ferdinand Bol, of Fabricius, ambaſſador to Pyrrhus, rejecting the bribes that monarch offered him to betray the intereſts of his country, and braving the means by which he ſought to intimidate him into his views. Another picture repreſents Marcus Curtius, pointing to the turnips, which he is dreſſing for his dinner, and telling the meſſengers who attempted to corrupt him, that a man accuſtomed to ſuch homely fare was proof againſt pecuniary temp-

tation. In the War Office, are animating repreſentations of all the gallant exploits by which the Batavians threw off the yoke of Spain. Nor ought a beautiful picture by Rubens to be forgotten, in which Venus and the Loves are uſing all their blandiſhments to ſeduce the great Turenne from purſuing his career of military glory; but the hero, proof againſt their wiles, leans with his elbow on a cannon, and fixes his eyes on a battle painted in one corner of the back ground of the piece. Over the door of the office of one ſecretary, is the Goddeſs of Silence with her finger on her lips: over that of the other, is a dog, the emblem of fidelity, watching the lifeleſs remains of his maſter. Over the door of the Bankrupt's Office, is the fall of Icarus, denoting the conſequence of raſh undertakings. But without going over the whole building, what I have already deſcribed will ſufficiently illuſtrate my poſition, that the arts of ſculpture and painting, as there employed, are excellently adapted to give ſtrong though ſilent admonitions to every ſpectator; and are contrived, with peculiar felicity, as leſſons for the moral conduct of thoſe who, in the diſcharge of their official duties, have them conſtantly before their eyes.

My thoughts have been forcibly directed to theſe obſervations and recollections by a very recent occurrence. Being naturally of an inquiſitive diſpoſition, I find much gratification in prying into all the buſy ſcenes of this great metropolis, and lately availed myſelf of the invitation of a friend of mine to accompany him to the Cuſtom-Houſe, where he is in the habit of tranſacting buſineſs. On entering the Long Room, my attention was ſtruck by ſeveral large white boards fixed up in the moſt conſpicuous ſituations, with the following inſcription painted on them in black letters.

"*Notice.*

"The hours of attendance regulated. Every facility, diſpatch, and accommodation, to be afforded.

"The Commiſſioners of the Cuſtoms, agreeable to directions received from the Lords Commiſſioners of his Majeſty's Treaſury, hereby give notice, that the officers, clerks, and other perſons appointed to diſcharge any of the duties of this office, or acting therein, are required to give attendance from the hours of 10 in the morning till 3 in the afternoon, Sundays and the other days appointed to be kept as holidays excepted; and that all officers, clerks, and other perſons, are required duly to attend the duties of their reſpective ſituations, and to give every facility, diſpatch, and accommodation, to merchants, traders and others, that the faithful diſcharge of their duty will permit; and in caſe any improper delay, wilful neglect of duty, or any other miſconduct, in any of the ſaid officers, clerks, or other perſons, ſhall be made appear to the ſatisfaction of the ſaid Commiſſioners, they will take meaſures to puniſh any ſuch officers, clerks, or other perſons, in ſuch manner as they ſhall think right, ſo that proper examples may be made, to deter others from committing offences of a ſimilar nature."

On enquiring into the origin of theſe admonitory denunciations againſt the clerks employed in that department, my conductor told me that they were not confined to the Long Room, but were placarded in every office throughout the Cuſtom Houſe, and without any reaſon being aſſigned, at leaſt that had ever come to his knowledge. It then occurred to me, that as this meaſure had been adopted by order of the Lords of the Treaſury during the late adminiſtration, it muſt have originated in the conviction of the then Miniſtry, of the neceſſity of a thorough reform, or, to uſe a common expreſſion, of turning over a new leaf, in all the public offices; and I could not forbear expreſſing my regret, that this great and good work ſhould have been interrupted by the ſudden change in his Majeſty's councils. My friend, however, with a ſmile, whiſpered in my ear, that the carpenter employed to fix theſe boards, having put one of them up in the room where the Commiſſioners themſelves hold their ſittings, had been immediately ordered to take it down again, with marks of great diſpleaſure. This anecdote detracted very conſiderably from the merit which I had before been diſpoſed to allow the Commiſſioners, the Lords of the Treaſury, and the late adminiſtration; as it ſhewed they intended to confine this black-letter ſyſtem of reform to their inferiors, and not extend it to the higher departments of the ſtate; though from what I recollect of their conduct, ſome of theſe boards might have been hung up in moſt of the offices which they occupied, with at leaſt as much propriety as in the Long Room at the Cuſtom Houſe. As I involuntarily gazed at theſe inſcriptions, every gentleman who caught my eye, appeared to look down as if he felt abaſhed and degraded; and while I pitied the feelings of the poor ſtigmatized clerks and officers, I could not help contraſting what I then ſaw, with what I had ſeen in the Stadt Houſe at Amſterdam. In the exhibition before me, I recogniſed no traces of All the Talents. Whatever credit it might do to the hearts, it certainly did none to the heads of the inventors; for public reproach and diſgrace deaden the ſenſe of ſhame, and are more likely to harden than reform: while, on the contrary, men are ambitious of acting up to the reputation they have acquired, and by being thought virtuous are often made ſo.

When I got home, and revolved on what had paſſed, I thought I might do my country ſome ſervice, by committing to paper the occurrences of the day, together with the reflections they had given riſe to, and ſending them to your Review, where, perhaps, they may catch the eye of ſome of his Majeſty's preſent Miniſters, and induce them to ſubſtitute the ſyſtem adopted in the Stadt Houſe at Amſterdam for that ſo injudiciouſly introduced by their predeceſſors into the Cuſtom Houſe of our metropolis.

This recommendation may be made with peculiar propriety, now that we are laviſhing ſo much of the public money in embelliſhing the exterior of St. Stephen's Chapel, and the venerable Hall and Abbey of Weſtminſter. While we are pulling down whole ſtreets to open a handſome approach to theſe noble edifices, and diſplay them to the beſt advantage; while we are doing ſo much to pleaſe

the eye, ſhall we do nothing to mend the heart? Let it not be ſaid that "we make clean the outſide of the cup and platter, while within they are full of extortion and exceſs." The advantages of holding up ſhining examples of true patriotiſm, exalted wiſdom, and incorruptible integrity, to the imitation of our great men, are ſelf-evident. What ſtateſman could for a moment ſtoop to the paltry conſiderations of wealth or power, with the diſintereſted examples of a Fabricius or a Curtius before his eyes? If the figure of the goddeſs of Silence, with her finger on her lips, preſented itſelf to a Secretary of State as he entered the door of his office, could he ſo far forget the allegorical admonition as to blab ſtate ſecrets? Or could any political character, looking up to that emblem of fidelity and attachment the dog, ever deſert his patron, as we have ſeen ſo many of them do, copying rather the example of the rat, who inſtinctively quits a falling houſe? But without deſcending to particulars, every boſom muſt feel animated by the repreſentation of virtuous and heroic deeds; and thus the good examples of the dead may be made to counterbalance the bad examples of the living. At leaſt the experiment is worth the trial. We ſhall give encouragement to the fine arts; we ſhall have our value for our money in painting and ſculpture; and whatever improvement we make in the public virtues of public men, will all be clear gain.

I am content to except our courts of judicature from this plan; for I am perſuaded that no inſtitution deviſed by human wiſdom can be more perfect, nor any conducted by human fallibility be more pure, than the adminiſtration of Britiſh juſtice; and the leſs of the public money we have occaſion to expend on the legal, the more we can afford to beſtow on the political department, which is certainly not too immaculate to be capable of melioration.

Looking forward with confidence to the adoption of this undertaking, I ſhall now exerciſe my invention, in deviſing appropriate deſigns for the decoration of both Houſes of Parliament, the Council Chamber, the Treaſury, the War Office, the Admiralty, the Secretary of States' offices, and in ſhort every office in which public buſineſs is tranſacted. When my ſubjects are all arranged, I ſhall ſubmit them to your approbation; and in the ſpirit of the Seer who wiſhed "that all the Lord's people were prophets," being deſirous of promoting the public good without regarding from what hand it flows, I thus communicate my intentions to your readers, inviting them to labour with me in carrying this great national object into effect.

ARCESILAS.

TO PHILANTHROPOS.

Sir, *Stratford on Avon, Dec. 10th*, 1807.

THE letter of March laſt, which you have ſo ſeverely criticiſed, treats of a ſubject which may not be quite agreeable to a diſſenter; but I hope that *that* is its greateſt fault. Men if they think at all

upon the ſubject, which is not always the caſe, believe their own religious principles to be right, or they would not continue in them. Of this you will yourſelf be ſenſible when you come to have fixed principles. Good Chriſtians, though they muſt naturally wiſh to ſee their own ſect in a flouriſhing ſtate, will ſubmit peaceably to the exiſting government. Worldly Chriſtians, having more at heart the advancement of their ſect as a party, than the promotion of piety, will not be very ſcrupulous as to the means which they may employ. If the friends of whom you ſpeak are of the former deſcription, I humbly requeſt them to re-peruſe the letter in queſtion in connexion with that which precedes and thoſe which follow, and they will ſee that my object is not to ſound the toſin of perſecution, as you would perſuade the world, but to guard the church from danger, and to purify it from thoſe ſpots and blemiſhes which juſtly offend, and ſerve to the increaſe of hereſy and ſchiſm. If your friends are of the latter deſcription, no apology is neceſſary, becauſe it would be uſeleſs. Every thing I ſhould ſay would be freſh matter of offence. The very great indulgence which my letters have experienced from the A. J. Review, every corner of which is precious, will convince all its true friends and admirers, even ſuppoſing them incapable of judging for themſelves, that the matter of them is important—that the manner in which it is treated, however it may be wanting in other reſpects, is not materially deficient either in candour or liberality.—— Sir, your ſentiments and opinions are of ſuch a nature that I thought the expoſure of them to the world by your own hand, made ample ſatisfaction for the injuſtice done to me in miſ-repreſenting my ſentiments, drawing forced concluſions, and imputing to me, without the ſlighteſt cauſe, a wiſh to induce his Grace of Canterbury to become the inſtrument of perſecution. Some true friends of this work, to whoſe opinion I ſhall always pay ſtrict deference, think that you ought to be combated. But with whom am I to engage? are you Jew, Turk, Infidel, or Heretic? Whenever I attempt to claſs you, fancy paints you to my eye a ſecond Ajax, ſpreading your ſeven-fold ſhield before all the marſhalled ranks of Sectaries. Here you will again introduce candour and liberality: but in thoſe articles I muſt decline dealing with you. As mine are I truſt of true Britiſh manufacture, and yours appear to be foreign, they would lie upon hand, for I could not find ſale for them among my connexion. Sir, as I have not, never had, and probably never ſhall have the moſt diſtant commerce with Wolverhampton, give me leave to aſk if it is in that town that diſſenters are not peaceably "permitted to proſtrate themſelves before their Maker in that way and in that ſociety which is moſt congenial to their own feelings, habits, and manners," without being envied and put in fear of perſecution?—whether the church and the ſtate muſt ſtand and fall together, I will not decide ſo poſitively as you do. The church might [poſſibly] become a Popiſh church, and the political government remain as it is. Were the church to become Preſbyterian, the government would probably be Republican,

in conſequence of ſome ſlight connection between religion and politics, the exiſtence of which you deny.* Some kind of connexion ſeems to have ſubſiſted between religion and the ſtate, from the earlieſt ages of ſacred and profane hiſtory; of the infringement of which in all ages mankind have been jealous. In the patriarchal down to the monarchical government, of which it was the prototype, we find the office of prieſt and ſupreme governor united. Rex Anius, rex idem hominem Phœbique ſacerdos, is one among many inſtances that politics and divine worſhip had a connexion. The Athenians did not deem the connexion between church and ſtate unnatural, when they condemned to death the wiſeſt and the beſt of heathens, and made it one of his principal crimes that ως μ Πολις νομιζει Θεους α νομιζει. Melchizedek, King of Salem, was alſo prieſt of the moſt high God. In the Jewiſh Theocracy ſome little connexion ſeemed to ſubſiſt between church and ſtate. Much more might, and has been brought forward by men of eminent abilities, to ſhew that throughout all ages, the connexion between church and ſtate was not thought to be unnatural. If Philanthropos think otherwiſe againſt the concurrent teſtimony of all hiſtory, ſacred and profane, together with his modern philanthropy, he has rather more than his ſhare of modern modeſty.—Sir, if you will not ſee that the church is aſſailed by enemies, no glaſſes that I can furniſh you with, will ſharpen your ſight. If St. Paul did not think it beneath his dignity, or contrary to his duty, "to mark them that cauſed diviſions," and to exhort others to do ſo likewiſe, is it below the dignity of the church to follow his example? St. Paul thought that ſchiſms were injurious to religion, and forbade them. Philanthropos thinks that they are beneficial, and encourages them. St. Paul and Philanthropos are at iſſue. Sir, that my "deſcriptions are forced and unnatural," and "my effuſions weak and intemperate," is to me a matter of regret. However, their admiſſion into this Review ſhews the candour and liberality of its conductor, to which you yourſelf bear no ſlender teſtimony. Though its pages exhibit ſome of the nobleſt ſpecimens of fine writing, the world may ſee that it condeſcends to admit even "Wolverhampton ſtuff." You predict that if our church be deſtroyed, it will be by a natural death, from its own obſtinacy in not applying the proper remedies; from its lethargic inertneſs and want of energy, not in its diſpoſition to perſecute enemies, but in thoſe reforms and exertions which are neceſſary to inculcate and enforce the true ſpirit of Chriſtianity upon a people becoming daily *more wiſe in their own conceits, and of more underſtanding than their teachers.* Granted, granted, whether preaching from ſhort notes, or extemporaneouſly, would ſerve the cauſe of religion more effectually than preaching from a written ſermon, I have a ſlight idea that you are not a judge,

---

* If you adduce America as a proof in your favour---take it. I ſhall not envy that.

therefore I withhold my aſſent to your dogma. I well know that the ſimple act of preaching extempore, or otherwiſe is conſidered as a ſufficient proof of the preacher's ſyſtem of faith, by numbers of thoſe who, like a new acquaintance of mine, "have itching ears." Sir, I am ſorry to uſe a harſh expreſſion towards you, but your remark on the preaching of the regular clergy is illiberal; and, ſlipping it in as you do for a general aſſertion, it is falſe. This is one of thoſe ſly thruſts at the eſtabliſhment by a pretended friend, of which it has ſo much reaſon to complain. Fie, fie upon ſuch a member of the eſtabliſhment! What ſort of preachers diſſenting miniſters may be, is known to me only from hearſay. When a boy indeed, I have heard field preachers. But I never wander; being ſatisfied with, or if it will be more agreeable to you, bigotted to, that faith and mode of worſhip in which I happily was educated. Of their printed ſermons I have ſeen ſome portion. With the majority of them it would be inſult even to compare the generality of ſermons and writings publiſhed by the clergy of the preſent day. On the ſubject of inexplicable myſtery, you are yourſelf ſo inexplicably myſterious, that without employing my candour and liberality I cannot explain you. I muſt therefore leave you in the midſt of that cloud of duſt which you have raiſed. Sir, pardon me for again introducing St. Paul. "Gal. i. v. 6. I marvel that ye are ſo ſoon removed from him that called you into the grace of Chriſt unto another goſpel. But though we or an Angel from Heaven preach any other goſpel unto you than that which we have preached unto you, let him be accurſed. If any man preach any other goſpel unto you than that ye have received, let him be accurſed." 2 Tim. i. 10. "Jeſus Chriſt hath aboliſhed death, and brought life and immortality to light by the goſpel." Gal. iii. 15. "Though it be but a man's covenant, yet if it be confirmed, no man diſannulleth or addeth thereto." Sir, was not life and immortality brought fully to light by the goſpel? or during the lapſe of eighteen centuries, has not the *whole* goſpel been preached? Has not the Chriſtian covenant been confirmed, or does it ſtill lack the aid of Wolverhampton philoſophy to complete its confirmation? Sir, I can ſcarcely be ſerious with you. "Improvements in arts and ſciences, habits or manners, or diſcoveries, philoſophical, moral or metaphyſical," can have no more to do with altering either the faith or the diſcipline of the Church of England, than improvements in the art of manufacturing buckle-chapes, hinges and ſtirrup-irons. Before you quoted you might have recollected that the Anti-Jacobin Review, to which you ſeem to appeal againſt me, would not admit Pope as authority in matters or modes of faith. That often-bequoted couplet ſerves your cauſe as ſteel diamonds do the handles of your poliſhed ſnuffers, which add to the glitter but diminiſh the ſtrength. It is idle and uſeleſs to hurl thoſe lines at me, if you conceive them to mean that a

good life can alone ſpring from a right faith. If, as your preamble to them ſeems to ſet forth, you intend them as a proof, that no matter what the faith, provided the life be moral, decent, and humane, (I would be underſtood to ſpeak of thoſe upon whom the goſpel ſhines) do you not completely reject the doctrine of juſtification by faith, and conſequently ſtrip yourſelf of all title to be a member of the church of England? You have already convicted me of bigotry, perſecution, envy, hatred, malice, and all uncharitableneſs, or I ſhould aſk, do you not alſo renounce the goſpel plan of ſalvation? According to your hypotheſis, Joſhua and the Iſraelites were more wicked than the Canaanites, &c. whom, at the expreſs command of God, they deſtroyed. This favours ſtrongly of Tom Paine. It is juſt poſſible that a comparatively virtuous nation might be made the inſtrument in puniſhing one deſperately wicked. The conduct of the latter might draw down juſt vengeance from the former, and yet the ſcheme of God's juſtice be carried on. But, leſt you ſhould call this *perſecution*, and ſo overthrow my proofs and my arguments, I had better retreat in time.—You ſay that you are a member of the church of England, &c. It is probable that by a member of the church, &c. we do not mean the ſame thing, and therefore it might be *uncandid* and *illiberal* in me to deny it. To ſhew that I am not quite devoid of candour, &c. I believe that you are a goer to church, (though you had well nigh forgotten to tell us ſo,) and a goer to all the meeting-houſes in Wolverhampton, merely becauſe you ſay it. But, pray Sir, tell me, is it a philoſophical, a moral, or a metaphyſical improvement, to turn the ſolemn ſervice of the Deity "*into a kind of muſical entertainment?*" Now, Sir, adieu. I am certain that you have ere this been convinced of my unfitneſs for controverſy, and that a laurel ſnatched from my brow would add no freſh luſtre to your own wreath. You will not therefore be ſurpriſed that I decline all future conteſt with you. I am no Ariſtæus. I have no bonds that can hold a religious Proteus, even though I ſhould catch him napping. Should I be hardy enough again to take up your gauntlet, perhaps as ſoon as I had arranged my arguments againſt an anabaptiſt, you would take ſhelter under the broad brim of a quaker.--Again, when my materials were properly diſpoſed for an attack, you, in beating your rounds in ſearch of truth, might be again converted by the charms of extemporaneous eloquence, give Chriſtianity completely the ſlip, and ſtart forth a philoſophized diſciple of Prieſtley. In your unwearied ſearch after truth, that the candle of your lantern may not accidentally go out, is the ſincere wiſh of

Your obedient ſervant,
FREDERIC DE COURCEY.

TO THE MOST REVEREND THE ARCHBISHOP OF CANTERBURY.

May it pleaſe your Grace,

ON the ſubject of non-reſidence I could write a volume. Volumes have indeed been written; but like applications to a palſied limb, little effect has been produced. When I reflect on the train of ills which the non-reſidence of the clergy has either produced or increaſed---the decay of true piety, the increaſe of ſectariſm, and the overflowings of ungodlineſs,---in the fulneſs of my heart I could "deſire that I were made a biſhop." But when I come to mark my own conduct with an impartial eye; to meaſure my own numerous deviations from the ſtraight line of duty, even in a retired and contracted ſphere of life, humbly am I thankful that my reſponſibility is not greater. In a more exalted ſtation intereſt might miſlead me in one inſtance; in another, the ſeducing calls of private friendſhip might warp my judgment; in a third, the love of eaſe and quiet, like the touch of the torpedo, might diffuſe its narcotic influence, and repel every effort to exertion. But if there be ſo many motives which may cauſe the individual to err, or to neglect his truſt, would it not be to the advantage of ſociety if the path of duty were marked in broader lines, and leſs were left to the fallible diſcretion of individuals? Why, my Lord, why not paſs an act of parliament *to enforce its former acts*, reſpecting reſidence and ſtipendiary curates? In almoſt every pleaſant country town your Grace may find knots of clergymen, many of them beneficed, ſome of them doubly ſo, who reſide there for the ſake of ſociety, that is---of tea and cards, &c. Their own livings are, forſooth, in diſagreeable ſituations; and as they pay a curate, they vainly imagine that they do their duty by their pariſhioners. Now, my Lord, I would aſk, by what plea of intereſt, of friendſhip, or of indolence ſuch clergymen obtained their licence or licences for non-reſidence in the very face of an act of parliament. It may be alledged that they ſerve curacies. Your Grace will pardon me---it is the duty of every man who holds the reins either of civil or eccleſiaſtical government not to ſuffer himſelf to be impoſed upon by appearances, but to ſift every thing to the bottom. Trouble it may occaſion; but the emoluments of the higher offices both in Church and State are generally eſteemed to be adequate to the full diſcharge of every duty that is attached to them. What they mean by ſerving curacies is, ſallying forth on a Sunday morning to read prayers and preach at the ſurrounding country villages: taking care to adjuſt the hours of divine ſervice, not for the accommodation of the pariſhioners, which I underſtand that every clergyman at his ordination undertakes to do, but that they may be enabled to *return home* to dinner. Did theſe clergymen *reſide upon* ſome cure, and *bona fide* diſcharge the duties of a reſident curate, it might be pleaded ſtrongly in excuſe for non-reſidence on their own benefices. But, can the payment of a ſtipend

to a diſtant curate, without one ſingle ſolitary enquiry how that curate diſcharges his duty, or how the ſpiritual health of the pariſhioners improves, can that be conſidered as a diſcharge in full for the revenues of beneſice, or for the duties of the incumbent? or can a flying ſabbatical viſit be conſidered as the diſcharge of that immenſe reſponſibility which he takes upon himſelf who becomes a ſtipendiary curate? Thoſe who fly from church to church, from the impulſe of dire neceſſity, I pity from my heart—Where they are blamable, let the blame fall on the heads of thoſe who make them ſo. A curate by receiving a ſalary takes upon himſelf a heavy charge. But the rector by paying that ſalary by no means exonerates himſelf from that ſtewardſhip, an account of which will one day be required at his hand.

With the moſt ſincere reſpect,

I am your Grace's obedient ſervant,

Dec. 24th, 1807. FREDERIC DE COURCEY.

SAVAGE'S ACCOUNT OF NEW ZEALAND—AND THE EDINBURGH REVIEW.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE ANTI-JACOBIN REVIEW.

Sir,

HAVING read your obſervations in your Review of Savage's Account of New Zealand, and having ſeen your opinion contraſted with that of the Edinburgh Review, in the Satiriſt, I have deemed it proper, as a more recent New Zealand traveller than Mr. Savage, to ſtate to you, in confirmation of the opinion you have advanced, that I have many doubts in my mind whether Mr. Savage ever ſet a foot on New Zealand: if he did, it muſt have been in ſuch a manner as to afford him but a very imperfect glance of the domeſtic economy of its inhabitants; all his knowledge of them amounts to very little more than what he ſaw of them on board the ſhip. From my knowledge of that country, the whole appears to me to have been a job between the author, Murray, Conſtable and Co.—Indeed, I have lately learnt from reſpectable authority, that, previous to the materials being put to preſs, a party intimately connected with the Edinburgh Review had promiſed it ſhould be favourably reviewed in that work.

A. M., *a South Sea Voyager.*

New Road, November 16th, 1807.

STAMFORD BULL-RUNNING.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE ANTI-JACOBIN REVIEW.

Sir,

MANY of the inhabitants of Stamford feel much obliged to your correſpondent P. S. for his letter reſpecting the diſgraceful *bull-run-*

ning there, and alſo to you for allowing it a place in your excellent Review, by which means it will ſo generally be made public.

I beg leave, however, to correct an error in his ſtatement: there is no *charter* for that *horrid* "*ſport.*" It is from cuſtom alone that its ſupporters derive any authority.

As to the plea of "ignorance," which you, Mr. Editor, have kindly urged in favour of the magiſtracy, I am ſorry to ſay it cannot avail them; for ſeveral years ſince, the late Lord Exeter (Recorder of the Borough), on application being made to him, took conſiderable pains, with the concurrence of the magiſtrates, to put a ſtop to this *nuiſance*, and partly ſucceeded; but at that time *many* of the *body corporate*, and ſeveral other perſons of ſome *conſequence* in the town, ſecretly ſupported it, and not only ſtill continue to do ſo, but even *join* in the brutality, being ſeen in the ſtreets mixing with the inhuman rabble.

Would you believe, Mr. Editor, that in theſe times *every avenue* of a large town, and that a poſt town between London and York, ſhould be ſtopped during a whole day—that all buſineſs ſhould *ſtand ſtill*—that every peaceable perſon ſhould not only be *confined* to his *houſe*, but even to the upper rooms of it? and for what wiſe reaſon are theſe inconveniences ſubmitted to? Why, for the *pleaſure* of *tormenting* to *death* a poor *animal*, the value of whoſe ſervices to mankind, whether alive or dead, we are ſcarcely able ſufficiently to appreciate.

I call upon the magiſtrates of the town to deny theſe aſſertions, if they can; and I alſo aſk them if they did not for *ſeveral* years by *official declarations* announce their determination to put a ſtop to a "*diverſion,*" (for ſuch it is called) which makes many of the humane inhabitants of Stamford aſhamed, when at a diſtance, to acknowledge their place of reſidence.

I am, Sir, your obliged and obedient ſervant,

HUMANUS.

Stamford, Jan. 8th, 1808.

ADMONITORY VERSES.

ETERNAL Providence, Supreme o'er all!
Thy interpoſing arm in love extend!
From that dread power, which would the world enthral,
Our lives, our liberties, our all defend!

When ſhall ambition's deſolating ſword,
Sated with blood, its ruthleſs carnage ceaſe?
When, to her earneſt vows and pray'rs reſtor'd,
Shall bleeding ALBION hail returning peace?

To God's reſiſtleſs will ſubmiſſive bow,
Ye who contemplate theſe eventful times!
He plucks the laurel from the conqu'ror's brow,
When fill'd the ample meaſure of his crimes;

Bids the deſtroying angel ſtay his hand,
Mov'd by his people's penitential tears;
With his protecting ſhield defends their land;
Their foes repels, and diſſipates their fears.

Warn'd by his judgments, and the awful fate
Of mighty nations ravag'd and o'erthrown,
May vital reformation, ere too late,
Avert his threaten'd vengeance from our own*!

Now, ſingle-handed 'gainſt a hoſtile world†,
BRITANNIA his Almighty aid implores;
While her triumphant banners are unfurl'd,
To drive the fierce invader from her ſhores.

---

* If the account publiſhed in ſome of the newſpapers, of the Duke of Clarence's birth-day, at Buſhy Park, be correct, it may be conſidered as a fair criterion by which to judge of our progreſs in national reformation. If, at a period when our national concerns wear ſuch a gloomy aſpect, thoſe who have ſuch an intereſt in the ſalvation of the country, and in the preſervation of our unrivalled conſtitution, and who, if they are not to be influenced by any higher motives, ought, for their own ſake, to ſet an example of regularity and decorum, can thus outrage common decency and public opinion, what is to be expected of the lower claſſes of ſociety? What, but that which we daily witneſs—the unbluſhing effrontery with which they imitate the licentious and profligate manners of their more criminal ſuperiors? By piety and morality, communities, as well as individuals, proſper, under the bleſſing of Providence; and irreligion, and immorality, and diſſipation, are the certain forerunners of the ruin of both. Where national diſſipation and licentiouſneſs have arrived at ſuch a height, reformation or ruin, therefore, muſt be the conſequence; and, to uſe the words of a late pious and elegant writer, "if the chaſtiſements of Heaven will reſtore thoſe virtues which proſperity ſeems to have impaired, ſuch corrections muſt be reckoned among the favours of Providence."

† In the beginning of September laſt, when theſe verſes were written, in addition to the confederated hoſtility of gallicifed Europe againſt this country, a rupture with the United States of America ſeemed inevitable. The ſeizure of the Daniſh navy has ſtruck a death-blow to the Northern confederacy; and, by the late proclamation "for recalling and prohibiting ſeamen from ſerving foreign princes and ſtates," the right of ſearching ſhips of war, as lately enforced in the caſe of the American frigate Cheſapeake, being unequivocally renounced, the principal obſtacle to an adjuſtment of the exiſting differences with the United States is removed. All the maritime States of Europe, however, with the ſingle exception of our faithful but feeble Ally, Sweden, are now hoſtile to us; and the Britiſh navy alone ſtands between the tyrant of the Continent and univerſal empire.

While faithleſs friends with deadly foes combine,
His over-ruling hand let all adore;
In infidel deſpondency repine,
Of impious human proweſs vaunt,—no more.

And O, no more be the diſtracted ſtate
By anarchy and envious factions torn;
The victim of intrigue and party-hate;
The ſport of folly; of her foes the ſcorn!

Henceforth may Wiſdom at her helm preſide;
Her ſacred rights and independence guard;
A nation's confidence, the patriot's pride;
A nation's gratitude, his juſt reward!

Eternal Providence, Supreme o'er all!
Thy interpoſing arm in love extend!
From that dread power, which would the world inthral,
Our lives, our liberties, our all defend!

WM. ROBB.

St. Andrew's, Nov. 14th, 1807.

TO THE PUBLISHER OF THE ANTIJACOBIN REVIEW.

Sir,

ALTHOUGH it will not juſtify your having publiſhed a libel upon me in your Review of December laſt, yet it may exempt you from the legal conſequences of a criminal proſecution, if you act ſo far impartially, as to give a place to the following authenticated refutation, in your next publication. I claim this of you as an act of candour, and common juſtice. In allowing a baſe calumniator, by means of your Review, to hold me out to the public as an object of ridicule or contempt, it muſt be preſumed that you were induced to give credit to the aſperſions thrown upon my character. From the documents which you have now ſeen (and which you are at liberty to publiſh, if you chooſe to give them a place at the end of this letter) you muſt be undeceived yourſelf, and therefore you ought to permit me, through the ſame channel, to undeceive your readers.

I am accuſed of inconſiſtency, becauſe I ſigned an addreſs in favour of governor Picton, anno 1800, and becauſe ſeven years afterwards, I publiſhed a work entitled, "*A Political Account of Trinidad*," in which I have certainly expreſſed my real ſentiments in diſapprobation of that gentleman's government. The fact of my having put my name to that paper is admitted. When I arrived, in the latter end of November, 1799, I became intimate with many of his friends; of courſe, I was not likely to learn from them any thing to his diſadvantage, as moſt of them were under his command; and, therefore, I did not hear thoſe

complaints, which new ſettlers generally heard. from the reſt of the community; becauſe, being very much aſſociated with his partizans, I was cautiouſly conſidered as one of them.

But, Sir, like many others who ſigned that unmerited addreſs, I might even have known the many *amiable accompliſhments* of the perſon in whoſe favor it was to be preſented, and yet might be induced to give it the ſanction of my name. "Between two evils chuſe the leaſt," is a maxim of prudence which we are early accuſtomed to adopt: and I perfectly recollect, that another *very popular* governor was at that time made uſe of as the bug-bear to reconcile the people of Trinidad to their lot. It was given out by the induſtrious canvaſſers for the addreſs, that unleſs colonel Picton obtained the civil government, a gentleman, well known in the Weſt Indies, but whoſe name I forbear to mention as he never obtained the ſituation, would be appointed.

The people of Trinidad, therefore, profited by the fable of the frogs, and rather "chuſe to bear thoſe ills they had, than look to others that they knew not of." I have ſaid, that I arrived in the latter end of November 1799, and ſigned the addreſs in May, 1800: at that period, only ſix months in the iſland. if I had known that torture had been, or would have been inflicted as the only teſt of innocence or guilt—if I had known that various executions had, or would have taken place, without even the form of a trial—if individuals had been brought to the ſtake and burnt alive under the cruel, barbarous, ſuperſtitious pretext of ſorcery and witchcraft—if ſuch things had happened on the ſpot where I was an inhabitant, and of ſome of which I was an eye-witneſs in Trinidad, and after being acquainted with ſuch deeds, if I had ſigned my name in approbation of any governor who could tolerate them, ſuch a polluted hand would have merited the moſt vindictive puniſhment from the Almighty Throne of Eternal Juſtice. No, Sir, though accuſed of being a philanthropiſt *only in name*, I was born an Engliſhman, and had not, by a few years reſidence in a tropical climate, ſo far forgot the early impreſſions of virtue and humanity, as not to ſhudder at the bare thought of ſuch uncommon cruelties.

A little truth is ſometimes uſed to give currency to a great deal of falſehood; thus it is, with the ſtory about the "*philanthropy of the tongue and of the heart.*" But though it is *true* that ſome ſuch thing was *ſaid* to me, it is *falſe* that it was *applied* to me. It was ſaid of Mr. Wilberforce, when in converſation I was making ſome remarks upon the neglect of negroes during ſickneſs; and during which converſation, Governor Picton had ſaid, that he had "always found theſe philanthropiſts to be great tyrants:" which, I told him, was a contradiction in terms: when he replied, "I know the uſe of terms as well as you or any man, Sir, I mean, that it is the philanthropy of the tongue, and not of the heart."—Theſe are the very words, and they were applied as I have ſtated. It was in conſequence of

this converſation, and of my propoſing to the people of Trinidad to appoint as an agent for the colony, a gentleman who had reſided at my houſe, and whoſe family is connected with Mr. Wilberforce, that I was held out to the community as a character obnoxious in the Weſt Indies—a philanthropiſt. And, I was informed by Dr. Dauxion who, overheard the treacherous deſign, that Mons. Boyer, Commandant of the diſtrict in which was my plantation, and others, were to *contrive* means of ſhowing that the management of my ſlaves did not accord with my ſentiments. By ſuch means, inſubordination was produced among my negroes, and ſo much was I made to feel the force of the plan *contrived* to undermine me in the community upon *philanthropic principles*, that I packed up all my books, which were numerous, upon the ſubject of ſlaves and the ſlave trade, and ſent them away to the care of Meſſrs. Simſon and Daviſon in London, leſt the governor ſhould hear of their being in my poſſeſſion, and ſeize them, in order to make them a pretext for perſecuting me as a philanthropiſt; and they remained in London until his departure from Trinidad, and then were returned to me. But, I will not treſpaſs longer on the pages you are willing to devote to the refutation of ſuch exaggeration, falſehood, and calumny, which the inſinuations upon this point convey, as, from their nature, I cannot, at this diſtance from the place, have much evidence to ſupport my aſſertions:—But, I muſt briefly ſtate, that the negreſs, who I am accuſed of ill-treating—is now no more.—She died, in conſequence of being ſent to jail by order of *Monſ. Beggorat*, without my privity and conſent, and without the commiſſion of any fault that I am acquainted with, unleſs it were a crime in her for another perſon to ſay, that he ſaw her nurſing one of *Roſette's* children in government houſe.—

The perſon who informed me of this circumſtance was a man named *Tom Anderſon*, a carpenter, who, having come up from my plantation, went to deliver his paſs at government-houſe.—This man was threatened with confinement in jail for having innocently told me the truth, not knowing the imputation it contained. The poor fellow, finding the miſchief he was involved in, fled.

The girl herſelf did not live to confirm this ſtory.-She died in conſequence of this impriſonment, whence I repeatedly attempted to get her releaſe, even by the written order of Mr. Beggorat, *which order is now in my poſſeſſion.* But I was told by Vallot the jailer that he had orders not to releaſe her until I could find the man a ſecond time, having once produced him, who had charged her with being employed as before ſtated.

In order to invalidate my opinions, of the government of Colonel Picton, in my account of Trinidad, I am accuſed of vindictive motives, and of perſonating a character to which I am not intitled, i. e. a doctor of medicine. In refutation of this deſpicable attempt, to injure me in a profeſſion by which I have hitherto provided for a large family, I refer to the documents your ſolicitor has ſeen, and

which may be referred to in the hands of my ſolicitor, who is known to you; and to confirm which I alſo may refer to Dr. Lettſom and Dr. Thynne, under whom, as conſulting phyſicians, I had the honor of being phyſician in ordinary to two medical inſtitutions in London before I went to the Weſt Indies.—Whatever, therefore, you may preſume to aſſert, as to the pretenſions of Colonel Fullarton, to a rank in which he has ſo repeatedly ſerved his king and country; I truſt as, notwithſtanding my preſent purſuits, I may ſtill reſume the practice of the medical profeſſion undiſturbed by the calumny and tyranny of a governor in Trinidad, that you will not again attempt to impoſe ſuch falſehoods upon the public, at the expence of my profeſſional reputation.

I am alſo charged with having declared "*upon my honour*," that I was not the author of the *Political Account of Trinidad*. This is another *little* bit of truth adulterated by a great mixture of falſehood.

With reſpect to the falſehood of my being turned out of company, and not reſenting it; I refer to the letter of an officer of the 57th Regiment, who was preſent at the only diſpute I ever had with Colonel Powell, the officer, whoſe name is ſo unhandſomely, without his knowledge, or conſent, brought forward in your Review, and which letter is a ſufficiently flat contradiction of this aſperſion, even if you had not ſeen, as you have, the original correſpondence of Lieutenant, afterwards Captain Wrenn, who was the Colonel's friend upon the occaſion. To theſe is added, the letter of a moſt reſpectable gentleman, Mr. Edward Rivers, now in London; which letter you have alſo ſeen, * (and it may, with the reſt, be

---

* Dear Jack, Jan. 2. 1808.

I HAVE been extremely ſurpriſed by ſeeing it ſtated in the Antijacobin Review, that you denied, "*upon your honor*," that you were the author of the "*Political Account of Trinidad*;" for I was preſent, when Capt. Holmes, dining at your table with a party, aſked you if you wrote the letter to the Duke of Portland. I remember, that you appeared deſirous of avoiding a direct anſwer; which was natural: for if you had not intended it to be a ſecret, you would have put your name to it. I think you aſked him whether you had not enough to attend to without writing books. But he ſtill urged the queſtion, and you certainly denied it,—*but not* "*upon your honor*."

You complained to me afterwards, that Capt. Holmes had placed you in the aukward dilemma of either denying the fact, becauſe the queſtion was put in the preſence of a gentleman unacquainted with the circumſtances; or of making Capt Holmes, and him, acquainted with a fact, of which they muſt either deny their knowledge, or expoſe it, contrary to the etiquette of table converſation, and the plan of your anonymous publication.

The other ſcurrilous inſinuations contained in the Review, I

publiſhed, or referred to in the hands of my ſolicitor,) all contradicting this falſehood in moſt unequivocal terms. And the officer who was *my* friend on the occaſion, is a major in the army, and I believe is now in England, ſhould it be neceſſary to refer to him.

It is alſo inſinuated, that I left the iſland ſhortly after this diſpute: but, as may be ſeen by my written leave of abſence from General Hiſlop, as ſurgeon general of the militia forces, this is as falſe as the other inſinuations; for, that document proves, that I did not leave Trinidad until four years and a half after Colonel Powell's affair; and other documents, which you have ſeen, alſo prove, that I was in the iſland in every intermediate year.

---

doubt not, you can prove to be malicious and falſe.—What I have herein aſſerted you may call upon me to ſupport.

Your affectionate Brother,

Dr. Sanderſon. (ſigned) AM. SANDERSON.

Copy of letter from Capt. Holmes.

Dear Sir,

I RETURN you your brother's, Mr. A. Sanderſon's letter, of the 2d inſtant, which appears to me, as well I can now recollect, a correct ſtatement of the anſwer given by you to me, when I aſked you, if you had written the Political Account of Trinidad.

Yours truly,

(ſigned) W. HOLMES,

Doctor Sanderſon. 10 Grafton Street,

Jan. 5th, 1808.

Copy of a letter from Edward Rivers Eſq. of the Iſland of Trinidad, now in London.

Cecil Street, No. 10.

January 14th, 1808.

Dear Sanderſon,

I HAVE received your note of yeſterday reſpecting the affair which took place ſome years back in Trinidad between you and major Powell then in the 14th Regt.

I can ſtate, with great certainty, that ſo far from your putting up with any inſult, the major ſent you a meſſage, and you made every arrangement for leaving the Iſland, in order to give him a meeting, and I was, with another friend, ready to be your ſecurity at the ſecretary's office, as is uſual on leaving that iſland; as well as being your executors in caſe of any thing happening to you, notwithſtanding it was left to your option to drop the matter.

I am ſorry to find your enemies ſtill continue to exerciſe their malice even in this country, but am ſure you will find no difficulty in defeating their views, and I am

Yours very truly,

(ſigned) EDWARD RIVERS.

Dr. John Sanderſon.

Theſe all prove, that I never was ſo treated by Colonel Powell, nor ever ſubmitted to any indignity from him. The miſunderſtanding with that officer was of the moſt trivial nature; the particulars of which I forbear to detail, becauſe I have too high an opinion of his honour and veracity, to ſuppoſe he would countenance ſuch an unjuſt, and unfounded aſſertion, as that contained in your Review: and, perhaps, if your publication ever reaches him, he may, as an act of candour, admit the truth of what I have ſtated.

But, Sir, even if I had poſſeſſed the timid character with which I am charged, it is not to be conceived by reaſonable people, that it could ever be imputed to me in this country as a crime, that I did not redreſs myſelf by infringing the laws of the land.

How far the author of this falſehood will, when diſcovered, be able in a court of juſtice to juſtify the attempt *to revive* a trifling diſpute, the cauſe of which was almoſt forgotten by me, and, I dare ſay, was wholly forgotten by the officer whoſe name is ſo ſcandalouſly and wickedly uſed upon this occaſion in your Review, will be a ſubject as worthy of his conſideration, as ſuch malicious falſehood is deſerving of the due puniſhment of the law.

This refutation having been ſubſtantiated to your ſatisfaction, your readers will no doubt agree with me, that you ought to be more cautious in future, to prevent yourſelf and them from being impoſed upon, by the wicked, at the expence of the innocent.

JOHN SANDERSON.

☞ As the publication of the reply of every author is conformable to the liberal and impartial plan on which the Antijacobin Review was originally eſtabliſhed, and has been uniformly conducted, we have excluded other articles that were actually in the preſs, in order to inſert the above in our preſent number; but the very late period at which it was received precludes the poſſibility of accompanying it with any comments.

☞ OUR Readers in particular, and the Public in general, are reſpectfully informed, that, henceforth, The ANTIJACOBIN REVIEW will be publiſhed by and for Meſſrs. Charles Cradock and William Joy (Succeſſors to the late Thomas Oſtell), No. 3, Ave Maria Lane, Paternoſter Row; by whom all Books, Letters, and other Communications, intended for, and directed to, the Editor, will be received.

N. B. Authors who direct their Publications to be ſent to the Editor may depend on having them duly noticed.

*** THE Table of Contents, Liſt of Authors, and Index to Volume XXVIII, ſhall be given with our next Number.